

Congressman Daniels Hails Freedoms Foundation Winner, George Toripow, of Kearny, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1967

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, last week winners of a special contest sponsored by the Freedoms Foundation, of Valley Forge, Pa., were taken as guests of that organization on a trip to historic sites connected with the establishment of this Nation.

Two members of the student-faculty group were residents of the 14th Congressional District of New Jersey, Mrs. Grace Kelaher, a member of the teaching staff of the Kearny, N.J., school system and a very outstanding eighth grade student at the Lincoln School in Kearny named George Toripow, who lives at 51 Johnston Avenue in Kearny. George, by the way, is a young man who was born in Poland and was selected as a result of both his academic background, leadership, and citizenship. Clearly, he is an example for all young people to emulate.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great source of regret that the press of business here in the House prevented me from being able to have lunch with this fine teacher and this very exemplary young man. However, my legislative assistant, who was

with them, reported to me that they were recipients of every courtesy from several Members of the other body, notably the beloved senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], with whom Mrs. Kelaher and George had lunch, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], as well as the chaplain of the Senate, the Reverend Doctor Frederick Brown Harris. To all of these fine men I would like to extend my personal thanks.

Mr. Speaker, Freedoms Foundation deserves the thanks of this House for this very fine program and, speaking for my constituents involved, I can report that it was a great success.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1967

(Legislative day of Monday, October 2, 1967)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Dr. Ralph John, president, Simpson College, Indianola, Iowa, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Thou in whose providence we find the time and substance of life, and before whom the nations rise and fall: Prompted by those who have gone before, and compelled by our own needs, we look to Thee for wisdom and strength sufficient for the demands of this place and age.

Frequently frustrated by the complexities of a world which recurrently defies simplification, and with hearts burdened by the errant impulses of a humanity which has not caught the vision of its common ground in Thy love, we ask Thy guidance for the living of these days. Make us perceptive in appraisal, courageous in advocacy, and above all, committed to Thy will and way. So may we claim our destiny as a nation, and Thy Kingdom, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, October 2, 1967, be approved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the un-

finished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2388) to provide and improve the Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, how does the time stand?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time is divided between the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. DIRKSEN. And how much time remains?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. An hour on each side.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Missouri on a nongermane subject.

A PROPOSAL LOOKING TOWARD PEACE IN VIETNAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, yesterday, for some hours, there was discussion on the Senate floor about the war in Vietnam, with many Senators on both sides of the aisle recommending that the United States cease the part of the war in which this country has definite superiority; but no recommendations with respect to that part in which our superiority is clearly more in question.

In the Washington Post this morning, an editorial entitled "The Lesson of Con Thien" is especially interesting to me because I was in the Con Thien area a few days ago.

The editorial illustrates only too well "the perils and pitfalls and hard disciplines of limited war," now limited to the point where the already heavy casualties to U.S. forces are increasing; limited to the point where the prestige of this country is being affected, all over the world.

Nevertheless, as evidenced yesterday, some are now demanding that the war be still more limited.

I ask unanimous consent that this edi-

torial be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have just returned from a trip to the Far East, Middle East, and Europe, having visited Japan, Hong Kong, South Vietnam, Laos, Thailand, Israel, Greece, Italy, and Great Britain.

A report of findings and conclusions will be made shortly to the chairmen of the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees. In the meantime, however, one can only view with increased apprehension both the nature and the extent of the current worldwide commitments of the United States.

In Vietnam the pot has boiled over. In other countries where we have binding commitments, however, the water also is becoming very warm indeed.

In this connection, one notes the strange paradox of the brilliant military victory recently achieved by Israel against sophisticated Soviet weaponry nevertheless resulting in a much improved Soviet position in the Middle East; because both the United Arab Republic and Syria were left so weak militarily they can only hope to be rearmed by the Soviet on the latter's terms—said rearmament is proceeding rapidly, to the point where 70 percent of their air equipment losses have now been replaced.

The Soviet position is also improving steadily in the western Mediterranean. Today Algeria is probably the strongest Arab country in their orbit; and if there is any truth in the rumor that General de Gaulle plans to turn over to Algeria the great naval base of Mers el Kebir, the Soviets will obtain further significant leverage in that part of the Mediterranean.

Such a development would, in effect, turn the southern flank of SHAPE; and the original concept of NATO, already heavily damaged in the center by the withdrawal of France, would be weakened still further.

The resources of any country, even those of the United States, are not inexhaustible; and therefore these developments in the Middle East and Europe should also be considered as we in turn consider future policies incident to Vietnam.

I have presented for many months my conviction that the United States is over-committed and overextended on a unilateral basis. We need a great deal of money to handle all these foreign commitments along with our growing problems at home, and we do not want to jeopardize the integrity of the dollar.

In addition, and most important, is the matter of American lives. In this latter connection, the campaign here to cease air attacks against North Vietnam is receiving full attention in the other countries. But all civilian and military people abroad confirm the sworn testimony before the Committee on Armed Services. All those with whom I discussed this matter warn that another cessation of the raids against North Vietnam would guarantee additional casualties in South Vietnam—13,500 Americans have already been killed, 85,000 wounded.

Instead of only another cessation in the air attacks against North Vietnam, therefore, I propose that this Government announce, as of a certain date, the cessation of all military action in South Vietnam as well as over North Vietnam; and also announce that there will be no reinforcements into the theater.

The Government would announce that these policies were being undertaken in earnest hope that their adoption would result in prompt and meaningful negotiations in the interest of a just peace.

At the same time, the United States should also announce that, if after this cessation of all military action in South Vietnam, as well as North Vietnam, the North Vietnamese, and Vietcong nevertheless continued hostilities, then the United States would feel free to pursue this war in any manner of its own choosing.

It would appear that the political objectives of the United States have now been achieved through the creation, by means of free elections, of the present Saigon Government; and the military objectives of this Government have never included the invasion of North Vietnam, the occupation of Hanoi, or the taking over of the Government of North Vietnam.

Concurrently with the above proposed announcement of U.S. policy, the Government of South Vietnam should announce its willingness to negotiate with anybody, and offer amnesty to members of the Vietcong.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 3, 1967]

THE LESSON OF CONTHIEN

The story of Conthien is the story of the Vietnam War. There is the same sense of stalemate and seemingly senseless bloodshed, the grinding attrition to no apparent or decisive purpose, the cruel inhibitions on our fighting men. And there are the same, perfectly normal, strictly conventional military reflexes at work—reflexes which have confounded so much of the conduct of this essentially abnormal and unconventional conflict. Indeed, the story of Conthien is not just in the spectacle of brave men dug in under a heavy handicap. It is in the spectacle of a limited war threatening to become a wider war because of a temptation to forget that our war purposes are limited.

This is the lesson of Conthien. It is not

Dien Bien Phu, or the Chosin Reservoir, or Verdun. Like almost everything else about Vietnam, it is without precise precedent. We can abandon it (which the French could not at Dien Bien Phu). It is not, by most estimates, of critical military significance. If it is rapidly acquiring political and psychological significance, that is in large part because we ourselves are making it a symbol of something—our resolve, our military prowess, our courage—which it need not be. All these have been amply attested to in Vietnam, and will be soon enough again. Nor does the honor of the United States Marines need vindication at Conthien. In a war of attrition, to use General Westmoreland's phrase, Conthien has played its part, for the Marines have taken the enemy's worst and returned it manifold.

Can it be that the sticking-point is mere territory? To accept this is to renounce a large part of what we have learned in the hardest kind of way in Vietnam about the conduct of "counter-insurgency" war. We are fighting to destroy enemy main forces, to help clear areas of guerrilla units, to expand security in populated areas—in short, to prevent the freedom of choice of the South Vietnamese from being foreclosed by force. None of this obliges us to conquer and hold a particular desolated strip of unpopulated territory.

A very good military case can be made, in fact, for the Marines pulling their base camps and prepared positions back out of range of heavy Communist artillery all across the DMZ. If the North Vietnamese bring their guns and rockets down into South Vietnamese territory, they can be dealt with on the ground without adding the new dimension to the war of a ground invasion of North Vietnam.

There is another compelling argument for doing so. Where the United States troops, and those of South Vietnam, take their stand in the northern slice of South Vietnam will very much determine where the so-called "barrier" against infiltration will be built. There is some military logic in having this defensive position also out of the range of Communist artillery over the border in North Vietnam.

Psychologically, this would seem to surrender a slim strip of South Vietnamese real estate to the North. In effect, however, we have been surrendering large chunks of the highlands and the War Zones to the enemy at one time or another all along. Search and destroy operations against mass concentrations of enemy troops and small patrols would still continue north of whatever positions the Marines might pull back to.

To state the case for pulling back is not to say flatly that this must be done. It may be that the Marines can hold out indefinitely and reduce their casualties by more effective counter-battery fire or deeper entrenchments. What would be indefensible, however, would be a prolonged defense of Conthien at the cost of heavy losses out of misplaced pride. Worse would be a stubborn defense finally impelling a ground attack over the border that would remove one more inhibition against a wider war.

If Conthien is to be a test of anything beyond the gallantry of our fighting men, it should be a test, not of our resolve, which does not need such testing but of our restraint. The lesson of Conthien lies in what it tells us of the perils and pitfalls and hard disciplines of limited war.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time to come out of neither side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, rather fortunately this amendment has been pending for some time and my basic statement has been available to Senators in their offices and on their desks. I realize that at this unusual hour, with committee meetings and other responsibilities of Senators, what I am saying here is largely for the RECORD.

I have offered this amendment because I am interested in the untrained having an opportunity for training and becoming productive members of our society. I believe that what I have proposed will do a far better job than the Job Corps.

My amendment is easily understood. It would repeal the Job Corps. In lieu thereof, we add \$195 million to the authorization for vocational and technical training under the 1963 act. This would double the amount of money going to each State for this purpose, if the amount provided in my amendment is authorized and appropriated.

Now, it stands out clearly and without dispute that this proposal would save \$100 million annually. In addition, the cost of operating the Job Corps is excessive. I think it is not subject to dispute that training in a vocational and technical school which is run by a State can be given at far less cost. I have estimated that it costs 2½ times as much to keep an enrollee in the Job Corps as it costs to keep a young man or young woman in a vocational or technical school that is a part of the State educational system.

When the Federal Government spends money for vocational education under the 1963 act, the States and localities have to match it; so for every sum of money spent increasing vocational and technical training by the Federal Government, as compared with the same amount of money given to the Job Corps, this expenditure would reach five times as many people.

Mr. President, here is a chance for the Senate to get rid of one bureau, reach five times as many people with better training, and save \$100 million annually.

One argument that pops up is: The very, very unfortunate people who are recruited for the Job Corps will not be reached by the State vocational and technical training courses. I say that argument is without foundation. I say they are not being reached by the Job

Corps. The Job Corps is picking up a few people here and there, flying them all around the country, flying them home for Christmas, flying supervisors here and there, and that is where the taxpayers' money goes.

Can anyone here tell us what happens to 75 percent of those enrollees when they leave the Job Corps? The fact of the matter is that the Job Corps is not making a dent in the problem of unfortunate people who are untrained and who live in undesirable areas, whether we call those areas slums or ghettos.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, what greater incentive could Government provide than to have well-run vocational and technical schools right in the midst of the ghettos? Can Government set a better example? They cannot. This is the right way to do it.

In addition, Mr. President, there is a part of this problem that is beyond the Government. Government must provide the schools, but the character within the people to want to be self-sustaining, to want to provide for their families, to want to amount to something, cannot be accomplished by appropriations or by the passage of a law. We will have to turn to the spiritual institutions and character-building institutions of the country in order to carry out that function.

I point out that whenever State and local people are brought into an operation of training the untrained, we get some forces that cannot be supplied by a bureaucracy running the whole show.

Mr. President, it is shameful the way in which bureaucracies are lobbying to perpetuate themselves. The time and energy high people in this agency are spending to promote the perpetuation of their own empire is shameful.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I hope the amendment will be defeated. Let us take a look at what it would do.

The Curtis amendment would repeal outright the present Job Corps establishment without making any provisions for its orderly liquidation. This would mean that \$144 million in facilities would be abandoned, with no opportunity to work out in an orderly way what is to become of them. It would mean that \$18 million in corpsmen allotments to their families—mothers, wives, sisters, and brothers—would not be sent home because they would not have the money out of which the allotments could be paid.

It would mean that \$23 million in conservation work would go undone. This, I think, is of as much significance to States in the East, such as Pennsylvania, where we have untold work which can be done in the Allegheny National Park, in Fairmont Park in Philadelphia, and State game and fish lands, as it is to a State like Montana. The present occu-

pant of the chair is well aware that there are inadequacies in appropriations for our national parks and national forests and an enormous amount of useful conservation work which has been backlogged for many a year.

Adoption of the Curtis amendment would mean that 80,000 deprived youth would not be served.

These are poor people. It would mean that the economic impact on 123 communities in 38 States where centers are operating and bringing money into communities and increasing the wealth of the inhabitants, these benefits would be lost. It would mean that over 125 million dollars in contracts with private industry would be terminated.

For, let us remember that a substantial part of the Job Corps' operations is under contract to private industry which is doing it for profit. Lytton Industries, Packard Bell, the brains of private industry in the management field, have been brought to bear on the Job Corps under a profit arrangement. All this would be lost in order to terminate the Job Corps program and substitute for it a middle class program, a program for the children of individuals who, in the ordinary course of events, are able to provide for their boys and girls, to send them to vocational educational schools, and see to it, if necessary, that they have the money for dormitories and food away from home.

But this program is directed to the poor, not to the middle class. This is a poverty bill. This is not a bill to improve the educational opportunities of middle-class American boys and girls.

That is taken care of in the Primary, Secondary, and Higher Education Act.

This is a bill for the poor.

This amendment would strike at the heart of one of the most important and one of the most successful programs to take young boys and girls off the streets and bring them into a healthy environment, to give them medical and dental services, to give them the kind of character building training which will turn potential juvenile delinquents into useful citizens.

This is a program which did, I will admit, have a shaky beginning, but now most of the bugs have been removed and 42,000 young people are benefiting from the program, with 70 percent of them getting jobs when they complete the program. All this would be cut away, at one fell swoop, if the Curtis amendment should be agreed to.

Mention is made of the fact that the Curtis amendment would cut costs.

Of course it would cut costs. Why would it not? It deals only with the training aspects of the rehabilitation program. Most kids who go to a vocational school do not need any particular extra training in character and in attitude. That is where at least 50 percent of the money spent on the Job Corps goes, to make good citizens out of disadvantaged youth.

Thus, necessarily, if we dismiss the whole problem of character and attitude, as my friend from Nebraska has done, surely, it will save costs. But the problem will remain. Is it not worth the cost to redeem the youth of this country through service in the Job Corps in 38 States—

coming from all 50 States? Is this not well worth the cost which, to be sure, is not low?

The program suggested by my friend from Nebraska is aimed at only half the problem, as I just said, and hence requires only half the cost. But what lies at the heart of the poverty program is the total rehabilitation of these youngsters. This is basic economics. It must also follow that we will have available for each of the young persons only one-half of what needs to be done, if the Curtis amendment should be adopted.

Why did these young people not respond to vocational schools in the first place?

They had the opportunity if they had the money—and all too often they did not have the money—to go to school as part of their secondary education, but they did not respond because they needed something else. In many cases, they needed a full stomach, a warm room, an understanding person to direct them toward the right way to achieve the good things in American life which they are being denied today. It was to give them these services, not as a matter of charity but as a matter of right that the Job Corps was established, in the first place, to give the youngsters a different environment. That is why the Job Corps fixed their teeth, gave them comprehensive physical examinations, performed hernia operations, put glasses on their eyes when they could not see, and provided a healthy diet to renew a body too long victimized by poor nutrition.

None of this can be done by turning half the money over to vocational schools. Not until these things are done can a young boy or girl begin to concentrate on a vocational career.

Human renewal is not cheap. Those of us fortunate enough to provide for our children from the moment they are born, through college and sometimes to graduate school, know the expense involved. To take a youngster who has not been so fortunate as ours and try to make a contributing citizen out of him is expensive.

It is also claimed that the local community from which a Job Corps youngster has been recruited seldom benefits from the time, money, and training that has been afforded the individual enrollee. May I suggest we take a look at the record.

Here are some figures about the Job Corps as of June 1967—about 3 months ago—the figures would be higher now.

There are 11 States in which Job Corps centers to this date have not been established. That means that there are Job Corps centers in 39 of the 50 States.

Although no Federal funds have gone into these States for construction and maintenance of Job Corps centers, these States have benefited from the allotments to dependents and readjustment allowances which are brought back with the Corps member to the State from which he was recruited.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield at that point for a question?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. What are the 11 States which do not have Job Corps centers?

Mr. CLARK. I shall be glad to obtain that for the Senator a little bit later. I do not have it on the tip of my tongue.

Mr. President, in this respect, the State of Louisiana has benefited to the extent of \$2,114,583; the State of Mississippi to the extent of \$1,783,507; Alabama by \$1,988,480; Georgia by \$2,357,997; and South Carolina by \$1,833,766. And these figures reflect only the monetary benefits, above the training and new skills which the Corps members bring back to their States.

The goal of the Job Corps is to prepare young men and women for jobs in which they can earn a decent living and through which they can become responsible citizens.

To illustrate my point, let us talk for a moment about the typical Job Corps enrollee.

He has had 8 years of school but he reads only at the fourth-grade level. That is because he has not been able to absorb his education properly—frequently because his ghetto school is no good.

Forty-seven percent of the males failed the induction eligibility test for the Armed Forces—33 percent failed for educational reasons; 60 percent from broken homes; 63 percent from homes where the head of the household is unemployed.

Almost 40 percent come from families on relief, and 80 percent have not seen a doctor or dentist in the last 10 years. What chance would these youngsters have in a vocational educational system? I suggest none. That is why the Curtis amendment is not a program for poor people. It is a program for middle class children, a program for children who have already had most of the amenities of life.

We know that for every 10 months spent in the Job Corps, the average Corps member gains 1½ grade levels in reading. This is over twice the gain he showed in public school before he dropped out.

Seventy percent of all Job Corpsmen obtain jobs, or reenter schools, or qualify and enter the military service. Those who have jobs receive wages of \$1.71 an hour. If we assume this youngster works at \$1.71 an hour for 40 years with no increase in earnings, he will return to the Government in income tax payments alone over \$11,200.

To talk of the Job Corps as a vocational program is just not to understand the average Job Corpsman whom I have just described. He could no more go to a vocational school, live independently in a dormitory, pay for his room and board, read his vocational manuals, than he could enter college. A vocational program alone is too far above him educationally and emotionally, and, I would say, culturally. This youngster needs complete human renewal, and that is what the Job Corps does.

So I think in essence the question in determining the vote on the Curtis amendment is: Do we want a poverty program or do we want to put more money into middle class education? We are putting plenty of money into middle class education. I have supported it in many bills of which I have been proud to be a cosponsor.

Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has used 12 minutes of his 60 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. I will yield myself, again, such time as I may require.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I would like to say a word about Job Corps costs, and here I refer to the committee report, page 14, which states that the committee has conferred with a number of Job Corps contractors, including those from industrial firms which have had long experience in cost-cutting methods. They conclude that costs are reaching rock bottom and cannot be further lowered without seriously impairing program quality. Center managers have expressed shock on learning the depth of disadvantage of the youths who enroll in the Job Corps.

Mr. President, mark this well: Remedial medical and dental services alone cost \$360 per enrollee. That is because these youngsters have not had a chance to have adequate medical and dental care because of the cost involved.

The seemingly high costs are necessary to remedy 16 to 20 years of neglect by local schools—whether they be in the humanities or technical or vocational schools—neglect by health agencies, and other community service organizations, and to overcome the handicaps of broken families and disrupted neighborhood life.

Indeed, costs are high, but the needs are great. Yet the committee is convinced that, in the long run, the Government will be fully reimbursed for these expenditures through the taxes derived from the corpsmen's subsequent greater earnings, not to speak of the savings to the welfare and correctional systems of the country as these youngsters are assisted in finding productive roles in society.

A comment was made, in the course of the debate, that—

Nationally, the Job Corps is in disrepute. It does not have the confidence of the American people. These weaknesses and failures are common knowledge and they have been well documented over the months.

I categorically deny that statement. There is not one word of truth in it. Of the more than 400 witnesses who testified before the subcommittee, only two advocated the abolition of OEO and the transfer of its functions, including the Job Corps, to other agencies. These witnesses included key representatives from such important national organizations as the following:

National League of Cities.
The U.S. Conference of Mayors.
National Association for Community Development.
National Urban League.
League of Women Voters.
National Council of Churches.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Conference of Senior Citizens.
National Council of Catholic Women.
American Federation of Labor—Congress of Industrial Organizations.
And the American Bar Association—surely not a radical organization.

All of these groups have supported the

maintenance of the Job Corps within OEO, and, in fact, many have recommended an expansion of the program.

In addition, the business community has become increasingly more receptive toward the OEO programs, and the Job Corps in particular, and plays a leading role in the operation of the Job Corps camps, as I noted a moment or two ago.

My friend from Nebraska said:

Nobody has an accurate check as to what happens to the Job Corps enrollees after they leave the Job Corps.

There is not a word of truth in that statement. Let me read from the committee report, at page 13:

Based upon sample studies conducted for OEO by Louis Harris & Associates, the Job Corps estimates that 70 percent who have left the Job Corps are working, in the armed services, or enrolled in school. The remaining 30 percent were unemployed, out of the labor force (such as young women who married), or whereabouts unknown.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, I yield. Before the Senator begins, may I say to him that I can give him the list of States where there are no Job Corps camps. I asked my staff to get that information.

Mr. CURTIS. I am neither offended nor stirred over the fact that the Senator stated that the statements in my speech were without a word of truth in them. Of course, nobody believes that absurd and ridiculous charge.

Mr. CLARK. I yielded for a question, if the Senator wishes to ask a question.

Mr. CURTIS. I told the Senator that I interviewed three of the top leaders of the Job Corps and I asked them what happens to people who leave the Job Corps and they told me that they had no way of finding out because they write them at the address when they enrolled, and when they are gone from there they have no check on any of them, but about 25 or 30 percent—

Mr. CLARK. Is the Senator referring to the Job Corps center in Nebraska?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Because the information is here in the National Office of OEO.

It may be that they do not have the information in Nebraska. In fact, when we talked to them the other day they seemed to be singularly confused. These are figures we got from Mr. Shriver.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Shriver is fighting the battle of his life to save his bureaucracy. I challenge Mr. Shriver to give a list of the figures based on Government figures showing where they are working right now.

Mr. CLARK. May I read into the Record the list of States where there are no camps?

Alabama, Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Rhode Island, and South Carolina.

Mr. President, studies made by Louis Harris, to which I referred a moment ago, are in the House hearings on the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1967, part I. The hearings were held from June 12 to 16. I hold in my hand a copy, which I shall be glad to furnish

to the Senator from Nebraska if he cares to look at it.

Mr. CURTIS. That is an opinion poll; is it not?

Mr. CLARK. No; it is a check, to see where they are. It is not an opinion poll.

Mr. CURTIS. It is merely a poll taken by a pollster.

I still challenge Sargent Shriver to tell what happened to the people who were trained in the Job Corps. He has no record of them.

Mr. CLARK. All I can say is that if the Senator from Nebraska does not believe Sargent Shriver, perhaps he will believe Lou Harris.

Mr. CURTIS. No, I did not say I do not believe him; I said he did not have the information.

Mr. CLARK. He told us he did.

Mr. CURTIS. Why does he not present it?

Mr. CLARK. He did before our committee. I just read it to the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. No; he gave a pollster's opinion.

Mr. CLARK. I cannot agree with my good friend from Nebraska. What was given us was an analysis made by his own assistants.

Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska commented about Job Corpsmen being flown all over the country and taking over hotels. The answer to that criticism is that during the early years of the Job Corps, it was the custom of the Job Corps to fly enrollees from their reception centers, where they were gathered, out to the conservation camps in the West. This was felt to be the most economic way to handle them, but Congress did not like it, so in 1966 Congress added an amendment to require trainees to be assigned to their own region, and the present bill requires assignment to the center closest to the residence of such enrollee.

If there is any puddle-jumping flying still being done—I do not think there is—it is because it has turned out to be the cheapest way to get the corpsmen to the centers where they are to be trained.

With respect to taking over hotels, it is true that in the early days certain hotels which were pretty much on the ropes—I can say from my own experience that the ones I saw were rather second-class hotels—were picked up at bargain rates in order to provide trainees in the Corps with the facilities where the corpsmen could be trained in urban centers.

I saw one such hotel myself, in Albuquerque, N. Mex., where there was a Women's Job Corps camp. I can attest to the fact that the Packard-Bell Co., which is the contractor operating that Women's Job Corps center, had really made a good and shrewd purchase—it may have been a lease, I do not know: I think it was a purchase—of a facility which was extraordinarily well planned for the conduct of a Women's Job Corps camp. The fact that it happened to be a hotel seems to me to be relatively unimportant.

Of course, the initial investment in capital facilities for the Job Corps is now over, because the committee bill, in accordance with the action of Congress last year, fixes the number of enrollees

at somewhere in the neighborhood of 42,000; and we do not want to see that number extended any further. The present facilities are entirely adequate to receive and continue the training of that many persons.

Let me not be too dogmatic about this. There are weaknesses in the Job Corps. There have been failures. My own view is that since Mr. Kelly took over as Director of the Job Corps, there has been an almost spectacular improvement in the caliber of its administration; and I must say, from what we see and what we have heard, including testimony from Job Corps graduates themselves, I am of the view that on balance, with some mistakes and some weaknesses, and at a cost which is high, the Job Corps program has done well and should be continued.

The Job Corps is a vital resource for the Nation. I believe it is doing as much as any other one of the poverty programs to insure that a substantial segment of disadvantaged youth shall be given the training which they require.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time. I ask how much time I have remaining.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania has consumed 25 minutes, and he therefore has 35 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. May I ask whether the 5 minutes I yielded to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] on a nongermane matter have been charged to me? In other words, I wonder whether I really have 35 minutes remaining.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. He has 30 minutes remaining. He has consumed 25 minutes, and the Senator from Missouri consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and, with the concurrence of my friend from Nebraska, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time to be charged to neither side.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will withdraw that request, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the previous order, that the remaining time be limited to 14 minutes, to be equally divided between the proponent of the amendment and the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, and that prior thereto, we have a live quorum, with the time not to be charged to either side; in other words, that we have a live quorum, then 14 minutes of debate, and after that we vote. There will be a request for a rollcall vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall not object, but before we proceed with that, I ask unanimous consent that a statement on the pending amendment concerning the Job Corps, prepared by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], who is necessarily absent, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOB CORPS STATEMENT, OCTOBER 2, 1967

(By Senator GAYLORD NELSON)

Since the beginning of our national effort to eliminate domestic poverty, no program has been as misunderstood and as un-

fairly treated as the Job Corps. Adverse reaction and political attacks, reported in the press and broadcasting media, have clouded the dramatic successes achieved by this imaginative program.

As part of its review of the effectiveness of the poverty programs, the subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty this spring visited the Camp McCoy Job Corps Center at Sparta, Wisconsin. I had the honor of chairing those hearings and of visiting with camp officials and enrollees.

I was deeply impressed by the accomplishments of that center in its few short months of operation.

As with any new program of such magnitude, its development was not without problems. Initial difficulties with individual Corpsmen and with administrative procedures are being resolved.

The Center is being run by the Office of Extension of the University of Wisconsin and the Radio Corporation of America. The program and work of the Camp McCoy Center are typical of similar camps throughout the country.

From 1965 to the present time close to 100,000 young men and women have been enrolled in urban and conservation camps. These young people are the most severely disadvantaged of our society. They are school dropouts, many Armed Forces rejectees and people who have had trouble with the police.

But they are still young. Society could permit them to continue to drift and to be a burden on the taxpayer, whether on welfare or in jail, for the rest of their lives. Or we can make an effort to bring them into society, to enable them to become productive citizens and taxpayers. The Job Corps chooses the second path, and has proven itself successful. There is no question that severe difficulties have existed in forming this program. The young people we deal with have been alienated and ignored by society all their lives. Repressive disciplinary action alone cannot solve the critical problems caused by the living conditions of these enrollees.

The Job Corps is not a welfare or handout program. It trains men and women to work and to earn a decent wage.

Mayor Jerome Cavanaugh of Detroit cited before our subcommittee here in Washington the benefits derived from OEO training programs. He said, "For the most part the dollars spent through local programs are investment dollars." The Mayor cited an adult and youth employment project which cost \$788,000 and assisted 1417 persons. These people, once jobless, now earn \$4 million a year in wages and pay \$650,000 a year in taxes.

Seventy percent of those who have completed the Job Corps courses have since been placed in jobs, school or the military. Those who are working earn an average \$1.71 an hour.

Not all those who enter the centers complete their training. But few people realize that close to fifty percent of those entering college fail to complete their degree requirements. Yet this does not reflect on the quality of American universities. Nor can it be denied that the experience was of great value to those who did not graduate.

This must be kept in mind when making a judgment on the Job Corps, which begins with young people who are, in effect, dropouts from the mainstream of our society.

We have in the Job Corps a unique example of cooperation between government and private industry in an effort to show America's poor that they can be helped through our existing institutions.

This effort has just begun. My greatest regret is that the program is so limited in scope. We are reaching only a small number of those who are in need of the Job Corps.

Tragic events of the past summer should alert us to the folly of abandoning the small starts we have already made in providing a chance for America's poor and disadvantaged.

Passage of the pending amendment would further erode the remaining confidence of America's poor in our commitment to help them.

Unemployment figures have taken on new and dramatic meaning in recent months. The rate in America's slums is three times the national average. Unemployment among Negro teenage boys is 31% and among girls it is 46%. Yet a recent survey revealed that 67% of unemployed slum residents are willing to take on-the-job training.

With the Job Corps a commitment was made to these young people. Today we are faced with a choice, to accept our responsibility and to continue that commitment or to attempt to turn the clock back. Reversal of the trend of these past three years is not possible. It can be undertaken only at a tremendous future cost to the United States and it cannot succeed.

Mr. CLARK. There may be other Senators who wish to put in statements also.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the New Statesman of London, September 1, 1967, had an interesting article on the Job Corps Center at Camp Kilmer, N.J., run by the Federal Electric Corp., a subsidiary of the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp.

In these days when we hear much carping criticism about the Job Corps and indeed the whole poverty program, it is gratifying to read observations by outside observers which recognize the value of this concept of job training. Indeed, Nora Sayre the author of "Jobs for the Dropouts," perhaps summed up in one phrase the true story of the whole Job Corps concept when she said:

The Job Corps has the simple evidence of success: thousands are now working who would probably have been on relief.

Mr. President, as we study the various aspects of the poverty program let us not lose sight of the basic fact that there are thousands upon thousands of American citizens who are ill prepared to take part in today's society. For some reason our past efforts have not reached the so-called hard-core poor. Since enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 these people have been reached. For the first time in our governmental history instead of applying palliatives to the problem of poverty, we are utilizing curative methods which, if given time and support by this body, can truly break the cycle of the poor.

I believe this article contains some interesting observations and without objection would like to have it printed in today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOBS FOR THE DROPOUTS

(By Nora Sayre)

From fire to fire the riots flare across the summer, while many liberals automatically deduce that the Anti-Poverty Programme is a failure or an irrelevancy. Yet, sifting the ashes and the shattered glass of riot sites, while counting the dead, should clinch the conviction that the Job Corps should be urgently expanded. Currently, there are 122 centres in the U.S. Camp Kilmer, in New Jersey—a former army base that once held Italian prisoners of war and, later, Hungarian refugees—has placed 2,039 of its 2,377 graduates in jobs. Staff members stressed that these particular young men might otherwise have been burning, smashing and dying. Aged 16 to 21, these school drop-outs are

damaged goods when they arrive—but all have come voluntarily. Conspicuous for self-contempt and uncertainty, they are selected according to need: poverty, bad family life, minimal education. Records of delinquency do not disqualify them, although "major criminal offenses" aren't acceptable, nor is retardation. At Kilmer, 70 percent are Negro and Puerto Rican. They receive \$30 a month, and average nine months' training; they can stay for a maximum of two years. On finishing they get \$50 for each month "satisfactorily completed." The Kilmer management is contracted to the Federal Electric Corporation, a subsidiary of the International Telephone & Telegraph Corporation.

The Corpsmen's reading and mathematics are improved so that they can receive the equivalent of a high-school diploma, and the choice of vocational programmes includes electronics, trucking, mechanics, carpentry, painting, cooking and offset printing. (At women's centres, the courses range from secretarial training to cosmetology.) Vocational counselling is intensive; a boy who's determined on electronics but has no ability is carefully guided to a related field. Another is advised against office machine repairs if he's going to return to a hometown of 200 inhabitants without a single typewriter. It's admitted that the kitchen is an inflammatory place, and that a nervous, irascible boy shouldn't become a short-order cook subjected to yells, heat and inevitably short tempers. They are trained in on-the-job behavior, dress and hygiene, and how to act during interviews and towards an employer ("Keep to the point, he doesn't want to know about your sex-life. Watch the hep talk.") and how to budget their salaries. City drop-outs are nocturnal creatures; they tend to sleep all day and roam at night, hence many are shocked by the requirements of punctuality. The intention is to raise them to a very strong apprentice level and to provide every graduate with a letter of introduction to a specific company. Industry and corporations have responded admirably, and Job Corps centres concentrate on encouraging firm representatives to visit the camps and inspect the professional level. Thus the Job Corps has the simple evidence of success; thousands are now working who would probably have been on relief.

However, personal rehabilitation is as crucial at Kilmer as the level of future employment. Counsellors and group-leaders stimulate Corpsmen to ventilate all their problems, including racial tensions (which do exist, but have not been serious), plus the numerous manifestations of homesickness. (They come from all over the U.S. Many miss their neighborhoods or city blocks, rather than their families.) There's an emphasis throughout on expressing feelings—which must be a fresh and startling experience for many, since impoverished parents often stress silence, especially by shouting at their offspring to shut up. Today it's quite astonishing to realize that a large group can be good for its members. While armies, offices and school dormitories deaden and deflate so many psyches, it's evident that Corpsmen thrive on mutual exposure and on their eventual concern for one another. There are nightly group meetings: quite often these focus on a boy who wants to leave, while the others try very hard to persuade him to stay. They say that they feel like failures when they can't convince a classmate to remain (Incidentally, anyone can leave whenever he wishes.) But the group aura is far from militant; Corpsmen say that they appreciate being allowed to work at their own different speeds, and the lack of competition. The staff is frank about intrinsic problems; one is the diversity of intelligence—mingling those who read like eight-year-olds with some who are college material. Discipline is naturally quite intense; fighting or returning drunk from a weekend results in menial tasks or fines. But,

talking to Corpsmen, one learns that they are very concerned about the Corps' reputation—and that they want each other to keep it clean. The verb 'to blow' is often heard at Kilmer; there are many references to blowing your job or your salary, as well as your cool. But repression isn't an albatross and griping is considered healthy.

Asked about their complaints (apart from the absence of girls, whom they do see on weekends or at many social events), Corpsmen were critical of the outside screeners who had glamorised the camp: "They promise roses and cream. Hence some are disappointed. Still, the national drop-out rate is less than 19 per cent. Over a canteen lunch of fried chicken and limitless gravy, three students of heavy trucking were indignant about the costs of the space programme, and very well informed about its budget in contrast to Anti-Poverty funds: 'So go to the moon. Later. Not now. We know too many people who need what we're getting here.' However, they (and others) seemed to have little feeling about Vietnam; the army is still considered good employment, and a fair number of Corpsmen later enlist. They said that there hadn't been much 'interest' in the recent riots in New Jersey or elsewhere. One behemoth added: 'I used to be a . . . [careful pause] . . . hell-raiser. Then I got sick of standing on the corner with the wine.' They all agreed that their previous lives had been boring—with your mother on your back all day long too."

Since the US school system caters for the middle-class, it has already failed to serve anyone who is eligible for the Job Corps. Tangible results are important for morale at Kilmer, from the tools and machine parts which a Corpsman can keep when he's completed them, to the final diploma. A librarian remarked that there's a fierce determination to own things—that Corpsmen are pleased by the fact that everyone's given his own paperback dictionary. Noting that thousands of wooden pencils vanish from the library, he suggested that 'there must be something symbolic about owning them', and, since the camp is strewn with a host of broken pencils, he thinks that many must snap them in half during spasms of momentary frustration.

There has been ample hostility to the Job Corps, plus many tinted distortions by the press. It's true that the first applicants were not so carefully selected as they are now and that discipline has been accelerated. But the arrest rate among Corpsmen is less than half that for their age group throughout the U.S. Antagonism probably springs from envy of the swimming pools and other recreational amenities that nearby townsmen lack, homespun racism and the educated whites' fear of competition from Negroes with good vocational training. Also, rescuing people isn't cheap. Since it costs about \$6,950 a year to maintain one Corpsman, there's a lot of rhubarb about 'the taxpayer's dollar'—ignoring the fact that Corpsmen themselves pay taxes. Even among liberal New Yorkers there's a lax readiness to believe that Job Corps centres are festivals of delinquency. Hence visits should be compulsory for every critic. Energy and professionalism make their own testimony. At Kilmer's driving school vast trucks weave slowly between orange barrels in a serpentine obstacle-course; in an auto-service station, Corpsmen's bodies dangle or protrude from capsize cars, amidst Plotonic showers of sparks an Irish instructor lyrically extols the poetry of welding and his students' exceptional 'feel' for the medium; the dilemma of perfecting a pumpkin pie absorbs a crew of intent cooks. The Corpsmen hardly wear halos, but there are cordial and courteous, greetings to any stranger. Numerous back pockets bulge with paperback books. Seeing so many alert and intelligent faces, it's hard to remember that many were almost illiterate not long ago.

Despite its achievements, the Job Corps'

budget has not been enlarged. The President is never shy of asking Congress for fresh funds for Vietnam; his requests for Anti-Poverty money are punctual but less passionate. This particular Congress may be remembered for its anti-riot bill, cutbacks in aid to the poor, and a recent vote for an elegant \$10-m. Washington aquarium that few natives are said to desire.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There being no objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 271 Leg.]

| | | |
|--------------|---------------|----------------|
| Alken | Fong | Metcalfe |
| Bartlett | Griffin | Monroney |
| Boggs | Gruening | Morton |
| Burdick | Hickenlooper | Mundt |
| Byrd, Va. | Hill | Murphy |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Holland | Pell |
| Carlson | Inouye | Prouty |
| Case | Jackson | Randolph |
| Church | Jordan, N.C. | Spong |
| Clark | Jordan, Idaho | Talmadge |
| Cotton | Lausche | Yarborough |
| Curtis | Long, Mo. | Young, N. Dak. |
| Dirksen | Mansfield | Young, Ohio |
| Ellender | McGee | |
| Fannin | McGovern | |

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG of Missouri in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

| | | |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|
| Allott | Hayden | Percy |
| Anderson | Hollings | Proxmire |
| Bible | Hruska | Ribicoff |
| Brooke | Kennedy, Mass. | Scott |
| Cannon | Kennedy, N.Y. | Smathers |
| Cooper | Kuchel | Smith |
| Dodd | Magnuson | Sparkman |
| Dominick | McCarthy | Stennis |
| Eastland | McClellan | Symington |
| Ervin | McIntyre | Thurmond |
| Fulbright | Miller | Tydings |
| Hansen | Mondale | Williams, N.J. |
| Hart | Muskie | Williams, Del. |
| Hartke | Pearson | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. Who yields time?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes. Let me say to all Senators now in the Chamber that we will vote in 14 minutes.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I should like to state what the amendment is about.

The amendment would repeal the Job Corps. It would double the money for vocational and technical training under the 1966 act.

If any Senator wishes to see how much money his State will get now and how much it would get if the full amount were authorized and appropriated; it is shown on tables 1A and 1B which are printed on pages 3 and 3A of my statement which is on the desk of each Senator.

Here is what we propose to do. By repealing the \$295 million item, we can double the money for vocational and technical training, save \$100 million annually, and reach five times as many people with training.

The cost as I have estimated it in my statement to operate a State vocational educational school, including dormitories and meals, this is far less than the Job Corps. The Job Corps is two and a half times as costly as a State or locally operated school would be with Federal funds.

When we consider that a Federal appropriation under the 1963 program must be matched, we would reach five times as many people. Here we have an opportunity to double the vocational and technical education money going to the States, eliminate one bureau, reach five times as many people, and save \$100 million annually.

The question has been raised that there is nothing in the amendment to provide for a tapering off. Yes, I am asking the Senate to vote on the general policy involved. Should the amendment carry, it will be a simple matter to implement it with additional amendments as may be necessary.

I contend that the present Job Corps method of taking a handful of people here and there, flying them across the country, then flying them home for Christmas, taking over hotels, is wasteful. It also sets a poor example.

Let us build vocational and technical schools right in the slums, right in the ghettos, so that all the people may see an example of education at its best where individuals can attend and graduate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 4 minutes of the Senator from Nebraska have expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall vote for the Curtis amendment. If adopted, it will increase from \$225,000,000 to \$420 million the money available for vocational training of the youth of

our Nation. The vocational training program has been an efficient and constructive instrumentality in vesting our youth with vocations fitting them for employment.

Its cost will be far less than the cost of \$6,950 per pupil in the Job Corps.

The cost of training a dropout in the Job Corps is at least twice as much as it costs to send a youth to our institutions of higher learning in Ohio.

Dropouts are brought in for enrollment from one section of the country to another at great and unjustified cost to the taxpayers.

Enrollees are hauled from one section of the country to another for the purpose of get-togethers at home, and are then returned to their original base. Vigorous complaints of misconduct keep cropping up from around the country, misconduct of the worst kind which has taken place in some of these institutions.

My vote will make available \$195 million more for vocational training where the job can be efficiently done.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I reserve the remaining minute and a half of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, as I recall, Senators who were Members of this body when the Job Corps was first advanced opposed it far more vigorously than I did. I felt then that there were many problems we had to anticipate, and I regret to say that many of my fears have been realized. The proposal which is now being put forward by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska is a step in the right direction, but I believe it is premature and that this is not the time to adopt it.

We must remember that we have a tremendous capital investment in Job Corps camps around the country. We must remember also that drastic changes have been made in the Job Corps program under the new Director, Mr. Kelly. Also, certain amendments which I offered and which were adopted in committee and on the floor of the Senate have, I think, strengthened the program immeasurably.

We must remember also that a number of contracts are outstanding for the operation of Job Corps camps, including those operated by big business. Many of them would be invalidated, and we would be faced immediately with a chaotic situation if the camps were closed. Furthermore, it is not possible for the vocational education personnel to take over those camps now. Perhaps in the future, they might.

Mr. President, I say regretfully to my distinguished friend from Nebraska that I cannot support his amendment now. If he offers it next year, or some similar proposal, I may have a different view of it then.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I want to read, from the report, the statement of the committee's consultant on the Job Corps:

The record of the Job Corps is clear: it tried to attract youth who had difficulty finding employment even in a tight labor

market. Two of every five enrollees in May 1967 had completed 8 years of education or less. And actual educational achievement was much lower than the formal education would indicate. Reading and arithmetic comprehension for half of the enrollees was at about the fifth grade level (or below). Nearly one of every three was unable to read a simple sentence or solve a second grade arithmetic problem. Two of every five came from a broken home, and two of every five from families on relief.

The difficulty will be that these young men are going to need special training. It is not really going to do any good to try to return them to vocational schools. Studies have indicated that vocational schools are unable to deal with the peculiar and particular problems that these young men and women are facing. It is only through institutions such as the Job Corps and programs such as the Job Corps program that they are going to be able to improve their education and be enabled to later become members of the labor force and contribute to their own families and to the community.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. It is not just a question of reeducating or moving people from the unemployable level to one that will enable them to have jobs. There is an additional problem in the spectrum of employment; namely, the middle area, from which one can get from lower status employment to more technical employment which has been largely removed by virtue of automation. So it is a problem that encompasses not only those not sufficiently educated or those who are borderline, but also the whole spectrum of employment. I think it is vitally important that we continue this program.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Job Corps camp at Camp Gary at San Marcos, 20 minutes away from my home, was the first established camp under this program. It trained thousands and has been one of the most efficiently operated camps in the country. It would be tragic not to continue it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

What would the Curtis amendment do?

One hundred and forty-four million dollars in facilities would be abandoned. Eighteen million dollars in Corpsmen allotments would not be sent home.

Over \$23 million in conservation work would go undone.

Eighty thousand deprived youth would not be served.

An economic impact on 123 communities in 38 States where the centers are operating would be felt.

Over \$125 million of contracts with private industry would be terminated.

We would substitute a middle class program and a vocational education program for a program to help the poor people of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has 1 minute and a half remaining.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, has all time been used except the 1½ minutes remaining to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time of the Senator from Nebraska except 1 minute and a half has been used.

Mr. CURTIS. Has all time except the 1 minute and a half remaining to me been used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I agree that the Senator should have the concluding argument, so I yield back my time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, let me again state we are voting on a policy question. Are we going to bring the States and localities into the program, to save money, and to bring the schools where the poor people are? If this proposal carries, there can easily be a detailed amendment on the tapering off. No one has risen to defend the Job Corps during this debate. The charge that they have been flying around, taking over hotels, is true. One of the first things that occurred at the hotel in Omaha was that they removed the Gideon Bibles.

Government can provide the schools, but flying people around or a law cannot meet the character question that causes people who want to learn to do something and be self-supporting. The only way to encourage people to do that is to establish a good school in the poor areas, and not by getting people to go away from home and nobody knowing what happens to them after they leave. I daresay very few return to improve their own surroundings. There is something about a partnership between individuals and the State and local governments that brings to people those things that make such training a success.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. The bureaucracy is making the fight of its life to stay in office. I ask for the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HOLLINGS (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. LAUSCHE (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is necessarily absent and his pair has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER]. If present and voting, the Senator Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 49, as follows:

[No. 272 Leg.]

YEAS—30

| | | |
|--------------|---------------|----------------|
| Allott | Ervin | Morton |
| Boggs | Fannin | Mundt |
| Byrd, Va. | Hansen | Murphy |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Hill | Percy |
| Cooper | Holland | Sparkman |
| Cotton | Hruska | Spong |
| Curtis | Jordan, N.C. | Stennis |
| Dominick | Jordan, Idaho | Talmadge |
| Eastland | McClellan | Thurmond |
| Ellender | Miller | Williams, Del. |

NAYS—49

| | | |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|
| Aiken | Hartke | Pearson |
| Anderson | Hayden | Pell |
| Bartlett | Inouye | Prouty |
| Bible | Jackson | Proxmire |
| Brooke | Kennedy, Mass. | Randolph |
| Burdick | Kennedy, N.Y. | Ribicoff |
| Cannon | Kuchel | Scott |
| Carlson | Long, Mo. | Smathers |
| Case | Magnuson | Smith |
| Church | Mansfield | Symington |
| Clark | McCarthy | Tydings |
| Dodd | McGee | Williams, N.J. |
| Fong | McGovern | Yarborough |
| Fulbright | McIntyre | Young, N. Dak. |
| Griffin | Metcalf | Young, Ohio |
| Gruening | Mondale | |
| Hart | Monroney | |

NOT VOTING—21

| | | |
|----------|--------------|---------|
| Baker | Hatfield | Morse |
| Bayh | Hickenlooper | Moss |
| Bennett | Hollings | Muskie |
| Brewster | Javits | Nelson |
| Dirksen | Lausche | Pastore |
| Gore | Long, La. | Russell |
| Harris | Montoya | Tower |

So Mr. CURTIS' amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE VIETNAM CONFLICT AND
WASHINGTON

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, for the past 2 weeks I have been in Southeast Asia, by leave of the Senate. This ancient land has, for a long time, been the scene of recurrent strife among the many peoples who have come there over the centuries. In the past generation, that strife has largely degenerated into fratricide, terror, and bloody war, in which the forces of fading colonialism, expanding Asiatic communism, and national independence have been contending. For almost all of my 15 years in the Senate, our own country has become increasingly involved. And from the very beginning, that involvement has produced some contrary views.

In the past few weeks, the American press, and—I can personally testify—the press in Asia, have reported an intensification of the debate here at home. Free and constructive debate, of course, is vital. The American people need to know the truth, and Members of the Senate have a duty to seek it out.

Last May, I said in the Senate:

The larger Communist powers must be on notice of the determination of the government and people of the United States to bring an end to our effort by negotiation, if possible, but by military force, if necessary.

Those remain my views now.

I cannot say that a fortnight abroad qualifies me as an expert. The fact is that, as with all human problems, there are currents and crosscurrents, good and bad, some full of hope, some full of despair. There are no clear-cut, guaranteed answers; and no catch phrase, however artful, can help guide us in this time of crisis. The views I express are my own, and represent my best judgment of the general situation.

Mr. President, as I see it, the American people face two basic issues in this tragedy. One is Communist aggression against South Vietnam and, less visibly, against Laos and Thailand. The other is

more directly in the sphere of the Senate and the Congress, as a matter of national policy. It is the question of the continuing commitment of the United States and its overwhelming might to collective security of free peoples in Asia.

In Vietnam our leaders, both civilian and military, believe they see a dim light at the edge of a distant horizon. There are visible signs of progress in allied military operations, and in political development, as well. Even America's severest critics recognize that our Armed Forces have destroyed Communist hopes for military conquest of the south.

Land communications among cities in Vietnam have been expanded and secured. Villages, long out of touch with major cities, have resumed nearly normal contact. In Pleiku, I spoke with Montagnard tribesmen, some of whom had not in decades had any relationship with the central government in Saigon. They are now learning that they are part of a large nation. Many of them are fighting for their homeland. In the Mekong Delta, waterways between the tributaries of that great river have been made secure for the passage of trade. Sampan operators have been quick to exploit this situation and, incidentally, to express their gratitude for protection against Vietcong extortion and terror. These roads and waterways continue to require vigilant patrol which they are receiving. But the access they give is vital to the health and progress of South Vietnam.

The allied military effort is now supported by a vast complex of port and airfield facilities. Our forces are no longer dependent solely upon the congested harbor at Saigon. Our air forces have been deployed widely over the entire countryside. They are able to respond rapidly to any call for air support. In military terms, the essential logistic elements are in place. The capital investment in our military effort has been made.

While our communications have become more secure, the Communist enemy has been pushed out of most of his base areas. Under continued pressure from the air, land, and sea, his units are forced to keep moving. Enemy casualties have been high, possibly higher than the Communists can replace at present rates of recruitment and infiltration.

In the northern provinces the war on the Communist side has passed largely into the hands of regular units of the North Vietnamese Army—so severely have the Viet Cong been decimated. In these areas, the initiative remains largely with our forces. As one officer said to me, "When you have difficulty getting a fight, you know the enemy has problems." The enemy seems to have many problems. Only when he can operate out of sanctuaries, such as the demilitarized zone along the border north of Con Thien, does he seek to engage our forces on a large scale.

I do not pretend to pass judgment on military developments, except to note these points which were confirmed by a number of sources, both civilian and military, both American and South Vietnamese. It is clear that a base for progress has been laid. The tide of battle has long since stopped running in favor of

the Communist Vietnamese. This is an enormous tribute to the thousands of American youth in uniform now serving in Vietnam. I spoke freely with them at every opportunity, from aboard the aircraft carrier *Coral Sea* in the Tonkin Gulf to a bivouac at Jackson Hole on the Cambodian border. Their morale is high. They have no fear. They believe in their mission. One-half million gallant Americans are participating in the defense of South Vietnam and the greater effort of knitting together the fabric of her nationhood. America is particularly fortunate to have the services in this struggle of Gen. William Westmoreland. His grip on the complexities of this unprecedented conflict has marked him as an outstanding military leader in our time. Without attempting to name them, our military personnel, from Admiral U. S. Grant Sharp to each of our enlisted men, and our civil servants, from Ambassador Bunker, and the other excellent ambassadors representing this country in that area, to our young advisers in the hamlets and in the villages, represent the finest kind of our fellow Americans.

The Communists now know that they cannot win on the battlefield. Their hopes lie in diplomacy and political action designed to divide and conquer the Vietnamese people. Here, our counter has been a determined effort to improve the life of the village people of South Vietnam and to free them from the yoke of Vietcong intimidation, extortion, and terror.

This program is making slow but steady progress. In Quang Tri Province, only a few miles south of the battle at Con Thien, I was able to see the work of a revolutionary development cadre in bringing renewed hope to a small village by building a new school, providing medical facilities and instruction, and by organizing self-government. I saw a similar process in the Mekong Delta, a village which only two weeks earlier had been under Vietcong domination and control.

Vietnamese villagers seem to respond readily to the offer of new life. Wherever security can be provided, the possibility for political stability is apparent. But, after decades of struggle, villagers are not always convinced that the central government's forces will remain. Some fear the day when the Vietcong may return. In the pacification effort, security is vital, and it must be sure.

Pacification is a crucial part of the struggle. The late President Kennedy called it "another type of war, new in its intensity, ancient in its origin—war by guerrillas, subversives, insurgents, assassins, war by ambush, instead of by combat; by infiltration instead of aggression, seeking victory by eroding and exhausting the enemy instead of engaging him."

This kind of war requires an intimate understanding of local conditions. It must, therefore, primarily be the mission of the Vietnamese Armed Forces and the Vietnamese people.

The Armed Forces of the Republic of Vietnam have taken large casualties in its national cause—over 100,000 total casualties and over 49,000 killed since 1961. Allied troops fight by their side against North Vietnamese regulars in

the provinces north of Saigon. In the populous delta in the south, they have the primary role. Their determination to continue to fight the war by ambush is essential it seems to me, to the success of the pacification effort and to the eventual freedom and independence of South Vietnam. They have undertaken this role, different from that assigned to the U.S. forces, by general agreement among military and civilian leaders in Vietnam. American commanders see clearly the need for this division of responsibility. They recognize that they can far better discharge the role of separating the Vietcong from the people as a whole. This is a military judgment and a military decision, and it makes sense to me. Without this work, the Communist Vietcong will continue to hold in thrall many areas of South Vietnam, particularly in the rice-rich delta region, where 40 percent of the South Vietnamese population resides.

South Vietnam is now at a critical juncture. The constitutional process is moving forward. The armed forces are ceding their authority to representatives of the people. Their willingness to prosecute the war will be increasingly susceptible to political pressures, both from within South Vietnam and from the world outside, particularly from the United States. God knows their score is not perfect. I visited a delta hamlet where a supposedly crack South Vietnamese unit did not, perhaps was not willing to, assume the initiative to protect the villagers.

I spoke at length with President-elect Thieu about the work of the army in the pacification program. He is dedicated to civilian rule and civilian control over the armed forces. He also recognizes the vital role of the armed forces in the pacification program. I believe he sees, as do our military and civilian leaders, that the gains of the past few months will be meaningless unless that program goes forward. Any untoward political development, any unreal psychological victory for the north, or a tragic reversal in the progress already made in the constitutional process could severely weaken the determination of the South Vietnamese Army to take on this important job.

This delicate situation must not be affected by any failure of understanding on our part. Collective security inevitably involves commitment. There can be no effective alliance without mutual and reinforcing support. The question of unilateral cessation of bombing and our nation commitment in Southeast Asia must be seen in this perspective.

Mr. President, while in Southeast Asia, I read statements by a number of my colleagues calling for a unilateral halt to the bombardment of North Vietnam by air as a means of opening peace negotiations. I also listened yesterday to some of my colleagues for whom I have the highest respect, as they spoke on this subject. So far as I know, the objective of these negotiations has not been specified beyond an expressed desire for peace.

The point I wish to try to make, Mr. President, is that a unilateral halt in bombing would be of great value to the

North Vietnamese. Five times in the past we have undertaken a cessation of hostilities in the hope of reaching the conference table. Each time the north has used this pause as a means of stepping up infiltration into the south and of resupplying its forces. Following the stand down for the Tet holiday in February, the Communists were able rapidly to expand their operations as a result of the respite from our attacks on their lines of supply. Many American lives were lost in later months because our open-handed action failed.

A tabulation of what the marines of the I Corps area euphemistically call "incoming" shows how important these resupply operations were to the enemy. "Incoming" is the name applied to inbound artillery, mortar, and rocket shells fired against South Vietnamese and American positions. As the American press has been vividly reporting in the last few weeks, this bombardment, largely from the sanctuary of the so-called Demilitarized Zone, north of the Ben Hai River, has accounted for a high percentage of our casualties.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this point in my remarks that a tabulation of incoming mortar, artillery, and rocket shells fired on American position in the I Corps area since July 1966 be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Without objection, the tabulation will be printed in the RECORD.

The tabulation is as follows:

INCOMING MORTAR, ARTILLERY, AND ROCKET SHELLS

| | Mortar | Artillery | Rocket |
|-------------------|--------|-----------|--------|
| 1966—July..... | 1,135 | ----- | ----- |
| August..... | 647 | ----- | ----- |
| September..... | 859 | ----- | ----- |
| October..... | 510 | ----- | ----- |
| November..... | 498 | ----- | ----- |
| December..... | 1,425 | ----- | ----- |
| 1967—January..... | 690 | ----- | ----- |
| February..... | 1,177 | ----- | 51 |
| March..... | 6,268 | 150 | 219 |
| April..... | 3,848 | 850 | 40 |
| May..... | 5,140 | 1,345 | 353 |
| June..... | 1,906 | 1,950 | 153 |
| July..... | 3,641 | 3,134 | 190 |
| August..... | 3,095 | 2,406 | 75 |
| Total..... | 30,839 | 9,836 | 1,081 |

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to refer to the tabulation, which is a tabulation prepared by fellow American citizens wearing the uniform of the U.S. Marine Corps, covering the period from July 1966, to August 1967. It demonstrates incoming mortar, artillery, and rockets from the demilitarized zone and from the southernmost portion of North Vietnam against our position and the position occupied by the Army of the Republic of South Vietnam in the First Corps area.

Mr. President, let those figures speak for themselves. It seems to me that they are convincing proof that during the unilateral bombing pause by the allies, the North Vietnamese were feverishly building up their positions in order to strike with greater force against our allies and our own American military personnel.

The tabulation shows at least a five-fold jump in mortar fire after the Tet stand-down. It shows the first appearance of artillery and rocket fire immediately after the pause. There can be no

doubt that this stepped-up action resulted from improved supply to the enemy's forces.

There are those who argue that the Communist North requires only a "face-saving gesture" in order to accept reasonable terms at the conference table. But the logic is far more persuasive that North Vietnam hopes to gain both military and political advantage by cynically exploiting the worldwide yearning for peace. Is there any one in this Chamber who is willing to contend that North Vietnam is not the aggressor?

The American bastions at Con Thien and Gio Linh, south of the demilitarized zone, have been taking hundreds of incoming shells fired from the DMZ and from North Vietnamese territory. A principal defense of those bastions has been aerial bombardment. At this stage, the loss of these allied positions would be a tremendous psychological victory for the north. A unilateral bombing halt would deny the Marine garrison at Con Thien now a vital air cover, and leave it open to massive ground assault.

On September 22, I saw Con Thien and Gio Linh. I talked with the men of the 3d Marine Division at Dong Ha. In the course of that trip, I observed a B-52 raid on entrenched artillery positions of the enemy in the demilitarized zone. The men of the 3d Marines live with a daily rain of incoming shells. I cannot understand how any fairminded approach to honorable negotiations would deny them their principal means of defense through air power while they are under attack. Nor do I believe that we can ever be expected to declare a unilateral stand-down that would permit the North Vietnamese unilaterally to improve their positions in this now critical area—the only place in Vietnam where regular Army units of the Communist north have been on the offensive in recent months.

Mr. President, Americans believe in peace. That is why we joined the United Nations. Americans abhor aggression in any form. That is why collective security has been basic to our foreign policy. Our presence in South Vietnam is earnest testimony of our adherence to those deeply held views. In our zealous quest for a speedy end to all hostilities there, we must not be blind to the indispensable necessity that the peace we seek to achieve must be both just and enduring. In May, I said in the Senate:

Whether we like it or not, the United States is committed today in Viet Nam. The issue before us now is not the origin of our involvement in the conflict but bringing it to a conclusion, honorably, and, hopefully, peacefully.

I like what J. R. Wiggins, the distinguished editor of the Washington Post, wrote a short time ago:

The scale of the Viet Nam war already has demonstrated that the price tag on such wars of national liberation is higher and the risk greater than the hawks of North Viet Nam must have anticipated. If there occurs in Viet Nam a demonstration that such wars involve an unendurable risk and an unbearable cost and are not likely to succeed, prospects for peace in the future will be increased.

Mr. President, I believe in the validity of that statement.

That the risk to the Ho Chi Minh

regime arising from her aggression is unendurable, and that the cost to her is unbearable is being made clear, and must remain clear.

Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew of Singapore said a few days ago that he would like to see the U.S. military forces withdraw from South Vietnam, but not too hastily, and only if the peace formula insured that the same thing would not be repeated in the other Southeast Asian countries.

The wrong kind of conclusion to the war in Vietnam—

He was talking about the possibility of an American military pullout from Southeast Asia—

can absolutely unscramble the whole lot of us in Southeast Asia.

The Prime Minister of Japan, Eisaku Sato, has repeatedly said, in recent days, as he toured Southeast Asian nations, that a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam war was of the "utmost urgency," but that an end to American bombing of the North alone would not be enough to end the war. Before stopping the bombing, Sato said:

The United States must have some assurance there will be a settlement.

He added:

If you say the right side is bad and the left side is good, you will never achieve peace. There is military infiltration from the North, and there is bombing of the North from the South. Somehow, only the bombing is considered as "bad," but the combat on the ground continues.

Last week, I flew to Vientiane, Laos. I spoke with Prime Minister Souvanna Phouma. His country's borders have been repeatedly assaulted by the North Vietnamese. Laos is perhaps next on their timetable. Small wonder that he ardently hopes that his nation will be left in peace. Among the free peoples of Asia there is a general hope that the cost of Ho's aggression will continue to be made so unbearable that they may have a better hope of living in a decent peace. Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Korea, Japan, Taiwan, and the Philippines all agree.

Mr. President, domestic American politics does not offer a satisfactory basis for a winning strategy in world affairs. North Vietnam, unable to win a military victory, seeks, as I say, a political one. She counts on our moral paralysis in the face of mounting pressure for peace of almost any kind in connection with next year's elections.

I speak both as an American and as a Republican. What this administration does to demonstrate to the Vietnamese, both North and South, that America's commitment is enduring, will have, I sincerely believe, the support of the American people, and surely, of this U.S. Senator. It is far too late in the day to throw away what free people have fought valiantly to achieve in Southeast Asia. America must not now sully her commitment to the security of free Asia to which she pledged herself by groping for a nameless settlement. We seek an end that will leave the people of South Vietnam in lasting freedom and independence. This represents, it seems to me, the difficult

path which leads to the best hope for just peace and stability in Southeast Asia and throughout the world.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, is this going to be a colloquy?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senator will withhold just a minute, I just want to say that the senior Senator from California has really made a very special speech today. It deserves examination and reexamination by every Member of the Senate and every Member of Congress, and I hope, sometime in the course of the day, to re-echo some of these sentiments, if I can find the time in the course of the debate. But I congratulate the Senator on the fruitfulness of the observations which he has made on his recent trip to Vietnam. He has been diligent about it. I think he has rendered a service to the Senate and to the people of the United States.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am profoundly grateful for what the Senator has just said. His is a powerful voice for national unity in time of crisis. I have followed his vote these 15 years on this subject, and I was glad to receive his encouragement for the 2 weeks in Southeast Asia which I have just concluded. I thank him very much for his words. I look forward to being present when, during his busy day, he will have an opportunity to speak on this subject.

I am glad to yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I want to commend the able Minority Whip for the clarity of his remarks in identifying the key issues involved in the terrible struggle in Southeast Asia. The able senior Senator from California has put this problem in the context of Asia. It is in that context that we must look at the problem in Vietnam.

I compliment him for an able—yes, a brilliant—speech in connection with his trip to South Vietnam.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend very much.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wanted to add to what has been said that I think the Senator from California has made a profound contribution to this whole matter. We can have our differences, but I think the great contribution he has made today is his honest attempt to put these questions in proper perspective. I compliment him.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to my able colleague.

Mr. MURPHY. I would like to join in the congratulations expressed in this Chamber to my senior colleague. I have had great regard for him over the years. I have never had more respect and regard for him than I have at this moment for the concise, simple, and knowledgeable statement he has made within the past 15 minutes on our problem in Southeast Asia.

One of the things that particularly im-

pressed me was the fact that he pointed out, clearly and distinctly, that there is no one in the Senate Chamber who does not want peace. There is no division in the Senate Chamber on that one basic desire. There is a division of opinion on the method of achievement of that desire, but the actual facts, in our eagerness to achieve that objective, become clouded and confused, and maybe we get into partisan attitudes when we should not.

I am so pleased that my distinguished colleague has laid before us, concisely, practically, and exactly, the position of this great Nation; our commitment, the reasons for this commitment, and the prospects for the future.

He has pointed out one thing as important as any other—that any open, obvious, and protracted disagreement as to the methods has aided, is aiding, and will aid the determination of the enemy to continue to fight.

As I said yesterday, there are two things our military people have suggested for a long time to stop the ability of the enemy to continue to fight: to stop the physical ability of the enemy to fight by cutting off his supplies; and, second, to make it impossible for him to believe psychologically that, somehow or other, there is a great division in this Nation; that we will falter in our purposes, that we will go back on the promise made by four Presidents of the United States, that, somehow, they can divide us and win a victory by default.

I congratulate my colleague for his clear statement.

During my trip, I saw people who walked miles to vote. When a bomb exploded among the people, injuring 39 and killing three, 20 of those 39 went to the hospital and then walked back to vote. These people have a determination for democracy the like of which I have never seen demonstrated. It is beyond belief that this great Nation, which has made democracy the foundation of our way of life, would ever walk out on those people.

I congratulate my colleague. I am so pleased about his report on the trip he has just made.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my good friend and colleague from California for his thoughtful comment.

He has put his finger on one of the profound truths of the election process in South Vietnam where almost 85 percent of those eligible voted. My friend was in that group of distinguished citizens representing all American points of view who were there and found that the election was valid.

I recall a rather interesting fact, which I am sure my friend knew, but I did not, that in the First Corps area, there was an 85-percent turnout.

Mr. MURPHY. We who sat there and watched the election tried to figure out mathematically how it would be possible for all those people to be processed through the polling places, with all the safeguards they had built in. We were amazed to find that in some of the northern voting places some 30 percent of the people had voted in the first hour in their eagerness to vote.

One other point I am glad to hear my

colleague mention that we did not discuss before he left was the example of the determination of these people and the will they had, which is sometimes misunderstood. This is not an emerging nation. This is a nation that has been in being for many, many centuries. This was one of the most attractive localities in the whole of Southeast Asia, starting in about the 1550's. First it was under the domination of the Chinese; then under the Japanese; then under the French. Now they see their opportunity to have their own nation—something they have sought for hundreds of years.

I met an old gentleman in Vietnam who said, through an interpreter:

We must have now a military government because we are at war, but as soon as we achieve peace then we will have a civilian government.

I am glad to hear that my colleague found exactly the same reaction on his trip. I sincerely congratulate him.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the able Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I certainly wish to commend the distinguished senior Senator from California for having made this very worthwhile factfinding trip to South Vietnam, and for coming back and reporting to us in the Senate and to the American people his findings in South Vietnam.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a question or two concerning what he has said on the floor of the Senate today.

My first question has to do with his statement, in colloquy with the junior Senator from California a few moments ago, relating to the validity of the South Vietnamese elections. If I remember correctly, the distinguished Senator stated that all of the people found that the elections were valid.

Very frankly, Mr. President, I was discouraged when I read only this morning that in the Constituent Assembly, when it was called upon to vote on the allegations of irregularities in the elections in South Vietnam, 58 members voted for the validity of the elections, and 43 voted that the elections were not valid, or that the charges of irregularities were substantiated.

Of course, the majority ruled, and the elections were upheld. But it was discouraging to me that 43 members did find sufficient evidence to merit their voting against the validity of the elections.

My question to the distinguished senior Senator from California is: Did he look into the charges of irregularities in the election proceedings in South Vietnam, during the course of his trip?

Mr. KUCHEL. First let me express my thanks to the Senator for his kind personal comments.

When I was in Saigon, there were articles in the local newspapers indicating that an attempt would be made to invalidate the elections in the Constituent Assembly, when it would meet, as it did meet, by law, yesterday.

I had a long talk with our own Am-

bassador Bunker and with people on his staff, with respect to the election and the allegations of fraud and illegality.

There were undoubtedly some instances of illegality in the election process; but surely not sufficient to require its invalidation. As the Senator will recall, for example, the winning ticket received roughly some 35 percent of the vote; so it could hardly be alleged that there was any attempt at controlling the ballot box.

The Senator will recall also that in Saigon, one of the defeated candidates ran strongest. Beyond that, there have been, regrettably, some very bitter religious problems in the whole South Vietnamese community.

To sum up and to answer the question, I think that, without any doubt, there were instances of illegality in the election. I personally am most grateful, as an American, that those instances of illegality were not found to have been sufficient cause by a majority to invalidate the process, because it would have been, as I am sure the Senator would agree, a highly regrettable situation had the Constituent Assembly found that fraud had vitiated the elective process.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I have often said that we could not expect perfect elections in South Vietnam. Unfortunately, we do not have perfect elections here in the United States of America in all instances; and the South Vietnamese people have certainly not had much opportunity to choose their own form of government and to participate in the democratic process.

But I was disturbed by the vote in the Constituent Assembly, and I repeat that I feel that 43 is a particularly large number of members to feel that there was sufficient evidence to invalidate the election proceedings. I had expected that an overwhelming number of the members of the Constituent Assembly would have found insufficient evidence to invalidate the election proceedings. I wondered if the distinguished senior Senator from California had some explanation as to why the number was so large.

Mr. KUCHEL. Without wishing to inject any unhelpful comments on the political life in South Vietnam, I do wish to say this: A number of members of the Constituent Assembly were candidates for the Senate, and, of course, a number of them were defeated. They became greatly aggrieved at their defeat; so much so that it was suggested that in some instances that bitterness, resulting from defeat, might have affected their judgment.

I simply indicate that to suggest that we cannot, from this distance, say that each of the 43 who cast a negative vote did it because he found that fraud had actually vitiated the process.

I have tried to say in one sentence that this is surely not all good or all bad. Many problems occur in the building of a nation, both civilian and military sectors. I am persuaded that the President-elect will have a civilian government and not a military government. I am persuaded that his Cabinet will reflect the influence of civilians in his Government. To that extent, on balance, I say as an

American that I am glad that there were more votes in favor of finding the election valid than of those who found otherwise.

Mr. BROOKE. Does the Senator have any assurance that there will be Buddhist representation in the Cabinet of the President of South Vietnam?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am not so sure that I should make a comment on that, other than to say that in my judgment, a sincere attempt will be made to find competent civilian Vietnamese who will give a broad representation to the various elements that make up the South Vietnamese society. Vice-President-elect Ky, of course, as the Senator knows, is a Buddhist.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, that brings me to my next question.

As the distinguished Senator remembers, upon my return from South Vietnam—and I talked then at great length with the distinguished Senator from California—I reluctantly concluded that our course of action in Vietnam was the only course which we could take at that time. I based this conclusion primarily on my failure to find sufficient evidence to support the contention that Ho Chi Minh would come to the conference table if we ceased bombing in the north.

I did say at that time, and I still say, that if it ever appeared certain that North Vietnam would negotiate upon a cessation of bombing, our Government should cease bombing in the north and attempt to bring a negotiated end to this disastrous war. Since my return from Vietnam, the two main alternatives which had been considered have been rejected by our Government and, I think in the main, by the American people.

One alternative was, of course, a further escalation of the war, whether by means of an invasion of North Vietnam or by the addition perhaps 1 million American troops. There are still some people who say, "Get it over with; knock them out, and win the military war."

However, our Government has consistently said that it is not our purpose to win the military war or to take over and occupy Vietnam. We are in Vietnam for two purposes. The first is to prevent the spread of the Communist regime by force and by terror. The second is to allow the South Vietnamese people an opportunity to choose their own form of government in freedom and security.

It would appear that we have achieved to some degree, both of these purposes. We have prevented the further spread of a Communist regime by force and by terror. And we have given the South Vietnamese people an opportunity to try to choose their own form of government in freedom and security. They have chosen the executive branch of the Government and they have chosen a Senate. And on October 22, they will choose a House of Representatives.

As the distinguished Senator has said, even though there were criticisms—and some of them very valid criticisms—of the election, this is the first time that the South Vietnamese people have chosen their own leaders. To the extent that they have been able to do so, we have achieved the second of our stated purposes in South Vietnam.

The other alternative to further escalation and an all-out war is withdrawal

from Vietnam. This has been a devastating war. We have had over 100,000 casualties and have suffered the loss of more than 13,000 lives. It is a war which is costing almost \$3 billion a month and which may necessitate an increase in taxes. Some people say this is too high a price to pay, and that we ought to just pick up and walk out of Vietnam.

The arguments against this proposal have been very clearly stated. It has been pointed out that we cannot do this. For one thing, the word of the U.S. Government is at stake. For another, we cannot leave the South Vietnamese people to the mercy of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese.

But there is a third alternative: a negotiated peace. This is where it appears that we get into very difficult ground. Some people, even on the floor of the Senate as recently as yesterday, have expressed the belief that we should cease bombing in the north in order to bring about this negotiated peace.

Our Government, speaking through Ambassador Goldberg—I think while the distinguished Senator from California was in Vietnam—asked the question whether Hanoi would assuredly come to the conference table if we ceased bombing in the north. We have not yet received a favorable reply to that question.

The next step, and the only step remaining if the Hanoi Government does not answer that question affirmatively, would be to cease bombing in the north to find out whether Hanoi would come to the conference table and negotiate a peace in Vietnam.

The question which remains uppermost in almost everyone's mind about the cessation of bombing in the north is, What will be the effect on American troops in Vietnam if we cease bombing in the north? As I understand the speech of the distinguished Senator from California, the statistics which he has given indicate that past bombing halts resulted in a buildup of North Vietnam's fire power and troop power, and that our forces suffered as a result of the cessation of bombing in the north in these periods.

I am not asking the distinguished Senator to look into a crystal ball. But did the Senator find that today, if our Government ceased bombing North Vietnam, we would have sufficient military strength, both in groundpower and airpower and seapower, to protect the American forces in Vietnam so that during this period of the cessation of bombing our ground forces and troops in Vietnam would not suffer thereby?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I want to make several points in answering the question which my able friend, the junior Senator from Massachusetts, raises.

First, I am completely persuaded, from the discussions I have had with our fellow citizens who hold the responsible military commands in South Vietnam, that we are winning the war in the south, at least against the Army of North Vietnam. Also, many of the areas controlled by the Vietcong during the past 2 years have been relatively cleansed. While there has been no flat interdiction, surely the flow of supplies from the north to the south has been greatly impeded.

I think there is unanimity of feeling

by both our military and civilian representatives in Southeast Asia that a unilateral cessation of bombing now would result in grievous harm to our men fighting at Con Thien and Gio Linh.

I think that point must be underlined. And I have tried to do so in my comments.

The fact is that it would have been far better yesterday if my able friends who take a different point of view had been able to excise out, in their urging that bombing be stopped unilaterally, the area which now is being used as a sanctuary, and from which our troops are being shelled.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, does the Senator mean that militarily we are dependent upon bombing of this area in the DMZ from which fire is being directed against our troops? Are we not able, with superior artillery fire, effectively to protect ourselves from this artillery bombardment that comes from the DMZ?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I repeat to the Senator what the military personnel there told me, that our area bombing of the DMZ, occupied by the North Vietnamese regulars, and the southern portion of North Vietnam constitutes a powerful defense for our Marine Corps personnel stationed at Con Thien and Gio Linh.

Mr. BROOKE. Is the enemy artillery in the DMZ superior to the artillery which we have on the southern side of the DMZ?

Mr. KUCHEL. I have listened to the military personnel talk about the strange manner in which this war is being conducted, in that one rarely sees the enemy. The enemy burrows and makes holes and has its artillery positions underground. He brings the artillery up suddenly and opens fire and then immediately withdraws, or moves it to another place.

Our military people feel that the B-52 strikes and the carrier-based strikes against that area have been highly successful. And, according to the press, the amount of fire coming into the south has decreased tremendously in the last few days.

Mr. BROOKE. Admittedly, air superiority is excellent to have, and we have air superiority in Vietnam. Also, it must be recognized that air superiority is a great benefit to the morale of our troops in Vietnam. These are all arguments on the side of not ceasing the bombing in the North without a commitment from the North Vietnamese. But if we are to make a decision as to whether we should cease bombing in the North in order to stimulate or to bring about a negotiated peace, it would seem to me that we must also look on the minus side of the ledger to determine not only what are the assets, but what are our liabilities.

On the liability side, obviously, we would lose the benefit of air bombardment of the DMZ. But are not our artillery pieces able effectively to protect our troops from the artillery fire that comes from the DMZ?

Mr. KUCHEL. I can only say again—and then I wish to make two more points in this answer—that from General West-

moreland down, it is felt that it would be a self-inflicted guarantee of higher casualties were that decision—to stop bombing unilaterally in this area—carried out.

We have unilaterally had a cessation of hostilities on five past occasions, with no indication that we had come any nearer to a conference table discussion.

I was most interested in reading in either this morning's press or yesterday's that Pham Van Dong suggested that the National Liberation Front—with which, of course, he contended there was no guidance from the North—had the great stake in this controversy. In other words, the North may well, at some point, in the negotiating process take the position that it is not solely competent to make peace—and that another set of conditions would have to be met by the free world in order to come to terms with the NLF.

I simply wished to make that point in our discussion.

Mr. BROOKE. Then, the best information that the Senator from California possesses is that if we were to cease bombing in the north unilaterally, the casualties inflicted upon our troops in Vietnam would be exceedingly high, and it is a risk which we should not take at this time. Is that the conclusion that the distinguished Senator has made?

Mr. KUCHEL. If I may paraphrase some of the words that the able Senator from Massachusetts has used, the answer is "Yes." I believe that our military commanders are correct when they indicate that a unilateral decision to halt bombing now would result in additional casualties to our own personnel.

Mr. BROOKE. And if the distinguished Senator rejects withdrawal and rejects further escalation of the war and rejects cessation of bombing unilaterally in the north, is it his conclusion, as a result of his trip, that we are compelled at this time to continue the war in the same manner in which we have been conducting it, until such time as the enemy hurts to the degree that he will come to the conference table and negotiate?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am not so sure that this conflict will ever result in a conference and formal negotiations. It could. As does the able Senator, I hope there will be a mutual cease-fire soon. However, the pacification program in South Vietnam is proceeding. One by one, hamlets will be secured. That program is underway, with all the difficulties that are involved.

With respect to our military operations, I repeat that, after a year in which General Westmoreland, given this responsibility, was able to build up our strength there—to establish new ports along the South Vietnamese border; to erect great, new airbases in the various areas; to organize a so-called riverine force, which would make commerce in the Mekong Delta and the Mekong River and its tributaries safe and potentially profitable—he then began to have the ability to seek out and to destroy Vietcong Communist units where they were hidden.

This must be made very clear: The only fighting that takes place is south of the 17th parallel, in South Vietnam—except, of course, for the bombing of the north.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, this

brings me to the final question. I have been discouraged by what appears to me to be an absence of total commitment on the part of the South Vietnamese people. I had hoped that after the election, the South Vietnamese Government would move with all dispatch to unite the South Vietnamese people behind the war effort. But we have received reports that the South Vietnamese Government—namely, President Thieu and Vice President Ky—have continued censorship of the press, and that, in addition, they have arrested some of their political enemies.

This is not the only time a plurality government has been elected; we have had them in the United States on three or four occasions, and we have had them in France and in Germany. But it would seem to me that since the present Government in South Vietnam won only a plurality of the popular vote, they would move immediately toward a coalition government, so that they could get the support of the people behind them. Censorship of the press and the arrest of political enemies is not the way to unite the people.

Did the distinguished Senator from California see any encouraging signs during his trip that President Thieu and Vice President Ky were going to move in the direction of uniting the people of South Vietnam, so that it would become their war and their effort, as we understand is being done in North Vietnam? Are they doing anything to strengthen their own army, and to conscript more men into the military?

As the distinguished Senator knows, they only draft men in the army in Vietnam at 20 years of age, while we in the United States are drafting young men at 19 years of age.

In addition they have never had more than 700,000 men in the South Vietnamese Army. What, if anything, is this Government doing to unite the people to a strong, well-trained army, and to bring about a total commitment of the South Vietnamese people?

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to give the Senator the comments of both President-elect Thieu and General Westmoreland in answer to the question. General Westmoreland tells me that in his judgment the South Vietnamese troops are becoming an effective fighting force. He made a comparison between the South Vietnamese personnel in uniform and those who were representing South Korea in the early days of the struggle there. In Korea, there was considerable difficulty in creating a fighting force in the Republic of South Korea, which, as the Senator knows, in later months became a highly effective organization. Incidentally, its units in South Vietnam are highly effective there.

He believes that the same development and progress is now commencing to show among the members of the South Vietnamese Army.

I talked to General Thieu about the time that a couple of people in the government were removed summarily for the commission of illegal acts, people who had been politically friendly to him, which I thought was an excellent sign.

I think we have to concede that the

history of this government has not been perfect. We will both concede that sometimes in our own country we have ugly instances of failure of servants of the people to devote themselves to the public trust. But without any hesitation at all, this fairly young man with whom I did have an opportunity to speak at some length, told me that it was his earnest desire to build his country and to unite.

I can only say to the Senator that I hope and believe that he reflects his own passions for his people in doing so.

Mr. BROOKE. Is there censorship of the press in South Vietnam at the present time?

Mr. KUCHEL. It is true, and the record must show that the military junta has from time to time closed down newspapers, and that, to our Western eyes, is surely wrong. However, I think that it is only a part of the complete picture.

Mr. BROOKE. Are political enemies being arrested at the present time in South Vietnam?

Mr. KUCHEL. I think there have been instances of that. As I left, one so-called or alleged political prisoner had been released. I think there have been some very unfortunate and regrettable examples of that.

Mr. BROOKE. Did President Thieu, when the distinguished Senator discussed the matter with him, say at any time that the government was going to cease censorship of the press or cease the arrest of political enemies?

Mr. KUCHEL. I did not specifically ask that question, so that I cannot, in all truth, tell the Senator. He did tell me he wants to build a viable democratic state, and that he wants the people and the representatives of the people to rule. It surely is true that there are great difficulties, but I doubt they are insurmountable, which must be overcome in order for any government to reach that point.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the distinguished senior Senator from California for this very informative discussion. I thank him for being so kind as to answer my questions, which I think need to be answered by one who has recently been on the scene in Vietnam. We are happy to have the Senator back home.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator. I listened to and carefully read the conclusions the Senator from Massachusetts made after his fact-finding trip. I think that the questions he raised are all relevant and some are very piercing. But we discuss them freely, and although there are not happy answers to some of the questions, nevertheless, these are the views that must be expressed.

Mr. BROOKE. I trust the senior Senator from California understands the purpose of what he said has been a piercing inquiry of several areas pertaining to Vietnam.

Mr. President, the decision our Government will have to make, and make sometime soon, as to what the next step will be in Vietnam is, of course, a very crucial one. If we do reject the alternatives of withdrawal and further escalation of the war, and if the Hanoi government, in its lack of wisdom, does not say

to the American Government that if we cease bombing they will come to the conference table and negotiate, it seems that, short of a miracle, our Government will soon be called upon to make the decision whether it can afford to take the risk and cease bombing in the North unilaterally, to see if the North Vietnamese Government will come to the conference table.

It is a risk more and more Americans every day are calling for us to take. It is a risk which more and more mothers and fathers and sisters and wives are asking us to take as so many more people are becoming involved in the war. Each year as more young men come of draft age, we will hear more people calling upon us to take this risk. I do not believe anybody in the country would ask us to take this risk if they thought it would be to the great detriment of our American fighting men in Vietnam.

Whenever it can be ascertained that we will not suffer immeasurably from taking the next step of cessation of bombing in the north to see if negotiations would take place then, it seems to me, at that time we must take that risk. Most of our allies have asked us to take that step. Most people across the world have asked us to take that step. Of course, they are not as informed about the military situation as are our military men in Vietnam. But their opinions and interests count, and it is a question that should be explored to its fullest. It was for this reason that I asked the distinguished senior Senator from California, who is our most recent colleague to have been in Vietnam, those questions. And it is for that reason that I am very grateful to him for having answered those questions based on his own factfinding on the scene in Vietnam. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, first I commend the Senator from California for his diligence in making a trip which must have been physically and emotionally very tiring and a great strain. I think he has made a great contribution.

I think he has been most eloquent today and, may I say, most patient in answering the questions of his colleagues.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] has covered many of the points I had in mind.

I merely want to clarify one thing: Obviously, I am one of those to whom the Senator referred—and I say this in all kindness—when he said that he read statements which were somewhat disturbing to him while he was on the scene in Vietnam.

On page 10 of the prepared statement of the Senator from California, he mentions Con Thien, as follows:

On September 22, I saw Con Thien and Gio Linh. I talked with the men of the Third Marine Division at Dong Ha. In the course of that trip, I observed a B-52 raid on entrenched artillery positions of the enemy in the Demilitarized Zone. The men of the Third Marines live with a daily rain of incoming

shells. I cannot understand how any fair-minded approach to honorable negotiations would deny them their principal means of defense through air power while they are under attack.

I concur. I certainly did not mean to imply by my suggestions that we were not going to give air support to our troops wherever they might be.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is most important. I think the Senator knows of my high respect for him. That is most important from the standpoint of clarification of what we are talking about.

Mr. MORTON. I am sure that the colloquy which developed in the Chamber on yesterday, as a result of the speech made by my senior colleague, in which most of us engaged—and I am sure I speak for him as well as for myself on this—did not mean to imply otherwise.

What I suggested was a two-way thing: reappraisal of the bombing, one; and, two, withdrawal to that 20 percent of the land where 80 percent of the people live. In other words, to abandon the hunt-and-destroy method and again take up the offensive which has been very costly.

I sometimes question why we have this enclave in the desolate and unpopulated northern area at Conthien, but I know that there are probably good military and strategic reasons for it.

I did want to make that point, because the questions I intended to pursue were most eloquently developed by the junior Senator from Massachusetts.

I appreciate this opportunity to respond to the Senator from California.

If the Senator would permit, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *Record* an editorial published in the *Washington Post* this morning, entitled "The Lesson of Conthien," the lead editorial which deals with this point.

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes indeed. I thank my able friend from Kentucky.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

THE LESSON OF CONTHIEN

The story of Conthien is the story of the Vietnam War. There is the same sense of stalemate and seemingly senseless bloodshed, the grinding attrition to no apparent or decisive purpose, the cruel inhibitions on our fighting men. And there are the same, perfectly normal, strictly conventional military reflexes at work—reflexes which have confounded so much of the conduct of this essentially abnormal and unconventional conflict. Indeed, the story of Conthien is not just in the spectacle of brave men dug in under a heavy handicap. It is in the spectacle of a limited war threatening to become a wider war because of a temptation to forget that our war purposes are limited.

This is the lesson of Conthien. It is not Dien Bien Phu, or the Chosin Reservoir, or Verdun. Like almost everything else about Vietnam, it is without precise precedent. We can abandon it (which the French could not at Dien Bien Phu). It is not, by most estimates, of critical military significance. If it is rapidly acquiring political and psychological significance, that is in large part because we ourselves are making it a symbol of something—our resolve, our military prowess, our courage—which it need not be. All these have been amply attested to in Vietnam, and will be soon enough again. Nor does the honor of the United States Marines need vindication at Conthien. In a war of attrition, to use General Westmoreland's phrase, Conthien

has played its part, for the Marines have taken the enemy's worst and returned it manifold.

Can it be that the sticking-point is mere territory? To accept this is to renounce a large part of what we have learned in the hardest kind of way in Vietnam about the conduct of "counter-insurgency" war. We are fighting to destroy enemy main forces, to help clear areas of guerrilla units, to expand security in populated areas—in short, to prevent the freedom of choice of the South Vietnamese from being foreclosed by force. None of this obliges us to conquer and hold a particular desolated strip of unpopulated territory.

A very good military case can be made, in fact, for the Marines pulling their base camps and prepared positions back out of range of heavy Communist artillery all across the DMZ. If the North Vietnamese bring their guns and rockets down into South Vietnamese territory, they can be dealt with on the ground without adding the new dimension to the war of a ground invasion of North Vietnam.

There is another compelling argument for doing so. Where the United States troops, and those of South Vietnam, take their stand in the northern slice of South Vietnam will very much determine where the so-called "barrier" against infiltration will be built. There is some military logic in having this defensive position also out of the range of Communist artillery over the border in North Vietnam.

Psychologically, this would seem to surrender a slim strip of South Vietnamese real estate to the North. In effect, however, we have been surrendering large chunks of the highlands and the War Zones to the enemy at one time or another all along. Search and destroy operations against mass concentrations of enemy troops and small patrols would still continue north of whatever positions the Marines might pull back to.

To state the case for pulling back is not to say flatly that this must be done. It may be that the Marines can hold out indefinitely and reduce their casualties by more effective counter-battery fire or deeper entrenchments. What would be indefensible, however, would be a prolonged defense of Conthien at the cost of heavy losses out of misplaced pride. Worse would be a stubborn defense finally impelling a ground attack over the border that would remove one more inhibition against a wider war.

If Conthien is to be a test of anything beyond the gallantry of our fighting men, it should be a test, not of our resolve, which does not need such testing but of our restraint. The lesson of Conthien lies in what it tells us of the perils and pitfalls and hard disciplines of limited war.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] raised the question he did. I am happy to note that now, at least so far as the record is concerned, the situation relative to a cessation of the bombing is clarified, period.

The distinguished Senator from California has made an excellent speech. I commend him for it. He recognizes that there is room for disagreement. Disagreement is one of the strengths of a democracy. If a person disagrees with a certain policy, what has that to do with aiding the enemy?

If we are all to be robots, we might as well abolish the Congress of the United States, because when we are sent to Congress, we are sent here to express the

opinions we hold, in accordance with our conscience.

That is exactly what the distinguished Senator from California has done, and I commend him and congratulate him for it. What he has done is to make a worthwhile trip to Vietnam and then return with an honest appraisal. He has made his report to the Senate on his views. There were no ifs, ands or buts in it. He laid them out. That is as we all should do.

Getting back to what the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] said, he did clarify something which I am sure has been bothering the distinguished Senator from California and, as he seemed to indicate, some of the men fighting in places like Con Thien.

The Senator from California stated earlier during the course of this debate that he wished, when the matter of bombing was discussed, when it came to the 17th parallel, particularly Con Thien, that this situation could have been "excised out."

I think the formula of concentration and consolidation which the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has advocated is a cessation of the bombing in North Vietnam, but not along the 17th parallel, or along the Ho Chi Minh trails extending into Laos, so that our men—and that is what the other Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] has said—would be reinforced with the aerial protection necessary. It would be given them no matter where they might be in South Vietnam. To the best of my knowledge, the only area in which Americans are fighting on the ground in Vietnam is in South Vietnam at the present time.

Thus, I am delighted that this part has been straightened out so that the viewpoints of the two distinguished Senators from Kentucky can be made a part of the *Record* and so that our men at Con Thien and elsewhere in the 1st Corps will be aware of the fact that so far as some of the suggestions are concerned, they do not mean in any way, shape, or form, insofar as I am aware, that they will be denied this valuable support when they are under attack or when they are subject to attack.

The distinguished Senator from California has made a most worthwhile contribution in giving us—as soon as he returned—the benefit of his honest views.

I commend him for a fine report to the Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the majority leader very much. I join him in being grateful for the clarification of the cleavage which exists among us.

As I have pointed out, I am persuaded that our air arm has been of significant importance to our effort and our commitment.

With the clarification that my good and distinguished friend from Kentucky has just made to me, I think that debate and dialog on this subject should continue.

I want to make another comment but am wondering, first, whether the able Senator from Kentucky wishes to enter into colloquy at this point.

Mr. MORTON. I thank the Senator from California. Let me add one point: I

appreciate very much the words of the majority leader.

One other point is of significance. We have debate and dialog in this body. There is also debate and dialog in the other body on this matter. But when it comes down to the logistic support of our boys in South Vietnam, regardless of our agreement or disagreement on policy, 97 or 98 percent of the Members of the entire Congress have voted to give that support. This fact should be made known to our forces in Vietnam. I also think that the government of Hanoi should be—and is—sufficiently sophisticated to evaluate that point regardless of any discussion we might have in Congress.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator's comments are much appreciated. I thank my friend.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. I wonder whether the Senator from California has considered why North Vietnam, with 16 million people, is able to keep South Vietnam, with 15 million people, on the defensive, when we have been in there for the past 13 years with practically unlimited military support and psychological support and every kind of buildup. We have given the people of South Vietnam everything; 500,000 American troops are now there. Why is it that South Vietnam cannot defend itself? Why is it that South Vietnam will not fight for itself?

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator. We live in an age where we can see the frenetic and dedicated zeal with which some nations have attempted to take over neighboring societies.

I rather think that the good people of the United States who love the American way of life and who would defend that way of life, still, day in and day out, do not have that extreme single-minded and highly emotional regard for their ends—and they are honorable—that Ho Chi Minh and his people do have for their ends which are not so honorable. I know that militarily our people have respect for General Giap and the means by which the Vietnamese achieved, in the struggle against French colonialism, an important victory at Dienbienphu, which was a harbinger, in my opinion, to what then happened to the government in Paris.

This is a type of conflict that the late President Kennedy said is ancient; yet, the means by which it is accomplished in Southeast Asia is new.

I do not understand the Red Chinese regime. The other day I noticed in the paper that Red China abruptly closed its Embassy in Tunisia and, at the airport, this group from the Chinese Embassy gathered around the picture of Mao Tse-tung and began to read out of the red book, chanting what he said and waving the book in the air to make their points. We do not understand that human activity. We perhaps do not understand the dedication by which the Communist regime in the North intends to take over the South. But the fact is that they are losing. I am convinced of that, Senator, and I am convinced that the people in the South have an expanding opportunity to

create a viable state in Southeast Asia in exactly the same fashion that the Republic of Korea came from almost nothing into a viable state.

Mr. HARTKE. What I want to know is whether the Senator has ever considered why the 16 million people of North Vietnam, with the dedicated zeal to which the Senator referred, are able to keep South Vietnam, with 15 million people, on the defensive, even though the latter have, in addition to their own people, 500,000 of the best troops in the world, with the best military equipment in the world, with the most sophisticated weapons, and with airpower which the enemy does not have. Why are they not able to protect the south? Why is there not that dedicated zeal among the 15 million people in the south, that there is in the north with 16 million people? We have given the south military equipment. We have given them advisers. President Kennedy said, 3 weeks before he died:

We will give the help, but, after all, they will have to do the fighting.

Why are they not doing the fighting? Why do they not have the zeal? What is wrong? Have we made mistakes in our policy? What is it?

Mr. KUCHEL. I think I ought to observe that the Creator has endowed South Vietnam rather lavishly with resources. Rice crops are easy to raise. The ground is fertile. There is no problem of lack of rainfall. The people there are a peace-loving people. They have not been placed under the yoke of communism—nor do they want to be.

North of the 17th parallel is a dominant leader. He is a Communist, but he is a leader, Ho Chi Minh. The people in the north, I think it quite fair to say, are held subservient in complete political control.

The South Vietnamese people should not be denounced, Senator, because they are free from any desire to commit acts of aggression.

Mr. HARTKE. I am not talking about acts of aggression. I am asking a simple question: Why will they not defend themselves? Why does even General Ky say "We want the Americans to do the fighting"? Why do they not defend themselves? Where is the great leader in the south? The Senator says there is a great leader in the north. Is there no great leader in the south?

Mr. KUCHEL. The South Vietnamese have lost almost 50,000 male human beings killed in action, in uniform. I think it is a poignant and an eloquent testimony to their desire to save their homeland from Communist aggression.

I say this further to the Senator, because I think I sense part of what troubles my able friend. That is the Army of the Republic of Vietnam taking over the prime obligation of the war by ambush. This was a military decision which was made with the concurrence of our American commanders, for a number of reasons. There is the rotten war. There is the war of ambush. That is the war of the Vietcong coming into a village at night and slitting the throat of the head of the hamlet, of extortion from the citizens, of kidnapping and mayhem.

I think it is an additional tribute to the South Vietnamese that they have assumed the primary responsibility for the pacification of these hamlets at the same time that they stand by their ally in confronting the regular units of the North Vietnamese Army near the demilitarized zone.

Mr. HARTKE. I say to my distinguished friend from California that I think the American people, with this total commitment of \$70 billion for the military and a war which is costing about \$4 million an hour, a war in which we have suffered close to 100,000 casualties, can ask, Did we not train these people well? Can we not train 15 million people well enough to defend themselves against the 16 million of the north? Our boys are dying in the south, not in the north. What have we failed to do?

The Senator said there are reasons why the military made up their minds that we should take over the fighting and give the job of pacification to the South Vietnamese. Does the Senator know what the reason is? Is it not true that the military said the South Vietnamese could not do the fighting in the manner which is most effective?

Mr. KUCHEL. No. Perhaps when I used the word "pacification" I was not complete enough in my answer. The pacification program includes as the first requisite the security of the hamlets and the villages of South Vietnam.

There are two kinds of war taking place in South Vietnam. One is that in which regular North Vietnamese units are fighting against South Vietnam and her allies near the DMZ. The other is a strange war, in which the shadows and the foliage and the jungles are ready havens for the Vietcong who have been recruited in the south and the northern guerrillas who have infiltrated down through the demilitarized zone and down through Laos and Cambodia.

As I say, I am not going to make it my judgment that the conflict against the Vietcong and the northern guerrillas in the south is the filthy, nasty, rotten conflict. I am going to accept that description by the American commanders with whom I talked.

I accept equally their belief that that kind of a conflict ought to be combated by indigenous South Vietnamese people.

So I say to the Senator that, for the reasons I have already stated—and I shall not repeat them, except to indicate that I think the casualty lists are a pretty fair supporting argument for the views I have expressed—I think the South Vietnamese are becoming, as General Westmoreland has said, an effective defense force for their territory and their people.

My able friend from Indiana has said nobody is fighting in the North. Precisely. The fighting is in the South. As I asked in my comments, does any Senator deny that the North is the aggressor? I think the answer is "No." Nobody denies it.

Mr. HARTKE. I say to my friend from California that that is exactly why I was driving at the point so hard. It is well known that the invasion plans for invading the North have been drawn up for

a long time. Whether they will be implemented is another question; but everyone knows those invasion plans are ready.

I ask my friend from California, is that what he was advocating? Is he advocating, as the military clique of this country has been advocating, that North Vietnam be invaded? Is he advocating, that by these little hints and innuendos, such as we have heard before every step of this escalation as it has gone forward? First comes the hint. Now we have the statement of the former Ambassador to South Vietnam, Mr. Lodge, speaking in Pittsburgh, seemingly sending up another trial balloon. Is that what the Senator from California is telling the Senate, that now we must be prepared to take on the aggressor in the north, in his own territory?

While 15 million people, with the help of the most powerful nation on earth, cannot defend themselves on their own territory is the Senator saying, by inference, that we should invade the north?

Mr. KUCHEL. I shall not ask the reporter to read back all that I have said during the last 2 hours, but I do ask the Senator from Indiana to take a look at the RECORD tomorrow, and examine the words and phrases I have used, based upon which he can answer that question for himself. Meanwhile, I shall merely state that the answer is "No."

Mr. HARTKE. As I read the statement of the Senator from California, he says that as far as they are concerned, if they cannot achieve victory, "America must not sully her commitment to the security of free Asia by groping for a nameless settlement." The Senator says we must hold for a military victory until we have attained it.

I have repeatedly asked the Senator why those 16 million people of North Vietnam are able to keep the 15 million people of the South on the defensive, when they have 500,000 Americans over there fighting and dying. Why are they not able to protect themselves? I leave that question with the Senate.

Mr. President, I think this is a serious question. I think this is why so many Senators are concerned today. We seem to be hearing hints that there is about to be another turn of the escalation screw, such as we have heard before every one of these turns. Again we hear it said, "We are into it now, and we cannot withdraw."

All I can say is, I hope we never take that next turn of the screw, that we do not move again up that escalation ladder, from which there seems to be no return. The bombing of the north, the Tonkin Gulf resolution—each one of those things was a gradual step which followed little hints, little side statements, little inferences, with denial after denial that the situation in which we find ourselves would be the result.

I say to the Senator from California, before we invade North Vietnam, before that course is taken, the administration ought to think twice, three times, four times, or as many times as necessary, before it takes us down the road to utter ruin.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I most sincerely suggest that my able friend

block out a couple of weeks and visit Southeast Asia, and take a look for himself.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

THE COPPER STRIKE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we are approaching the 80-day mark in the major work stoppage in the copper mining industry. It has been apparent for some time that there is evidently no real desire, or at least no effort, on the part of the unions or the management involved to get together to bargain in good faith and to reach an agreement which might bring this situation to an end. In this respect both labor and management are at fault because up to this time both of them are not even paying lip service to the free collective bargaining process.

Both labor and management ought to, even at this late date, get down to hard discussions about ways and means by which this strike could be settled. At the instigation of various Members of the Senate from copper-producing States, Secretaries Wirtz and Trowbridge did call to Washington representatives of unions and companies during the first part of September. There was no progress reached toward a settlement at that time, and following this meeting both Secretary Trowbridge and Secretary Wirtz stated that the situation was hopeless.

I do not agree. I think we ought to give consideration to the miner and the smelterman who is out on strike, because his purchasing power is being diminished. The many needs to look after his family and his obligations are not now being met. Many of these people are seeking part time or other forms of labor in other fields. Many members of the craft unions in Butte, Anaconda, Great Falls, and elsewhere are moving to other parts of the Nation to find employment, and many of them will not return to Montana. The States affected are losing revenue at an alarming rate.

I am today requesting the President to appoint a study committee to assess the effects of the strike on the national defense effort. I am also requesting him to look into all the available means at his disposal to bring this matter to a head. I am hopeful that he and his advisers can come up with the means to cope with this long-drawn-out strike to which there is no end in sight. But, in all candor, the only authority I know of that the President has is the invocation of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Frankly, I do not think that Taft-Hartley is the answer, because it would cover only a period of 80 days, and then if no settlement were reached the strike might well begin again in the middle of the winter when conditions would be worse for the miner and the smelterman

and their families. I am not at all certain that legislation similar to that which now covers the railroad shop crafts difficulty would be the answer either. I do believe, however, that if collective bargaining in good faith is not undertaken in the immediate future by the companies and the unions that other ways and means will have to be considered in the interest of the economies of the States affected by the strike as well as the Nation as a whole.

May I say that I deplore the trend toward Government intervention in these matters—a trend encouraged by both labor and management—because it degrades the principle of free collective bargaining and it places in the hands of the central government powers it should not have and does not want.

I, therefore, request the unions and the companies involved to meet on this matter, and I would hope that consideration would be given to the possibility in Montana as it has already been given in Utah, of the Anaconda Co. and leaders of the respective unions getting together to discuss the matter as it affects my State.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, very few legislative items which reach the floor of the Senate raise such high emotion and feeling, year after year, as does the poverty bill.

And with good reason. The programs in the poverty bill are different in concept and in execution from ordinary Federal programs—and they are different because they are aimed at no ordinary problem. They are aimed at the problem of loosing the bonds of poverty.

For some people, these differences mark a bold and needed departure from traditional notions of Federal assistance programs. For other people, however, the differences pose a threat—the threat of the unfamiliar.

I find it strange that those who criticize the Government for not doing anything, or of not doing enough, for the poor, are very often the same ones who cry out that the poverty program should be rendered asunder, and that its component programs be transferred to old-line agencies—those same agencies criticized, out of another side of the mouth, for doing nothing.

I am one who sees the poverty program as a bold and needed departure. Innovation should not be restricted to private enterprise—whenever a severe challenge is being faced, then Government, too, should not rely upon old established patterns, but should construct a new organization reflecting modern

ideas and techniques. Only then can we be sure that our response to a complex problem will be sophisticated and effective.

That, I submit, is what OEO is doing. Those who took part in the creation of OEO in 1963 and 1964—within and without the Government and in both the legislative and executive branches—seized upon the single most important concept for breaking the bonds of poverty—the concept of opportunity. OEO was to be a way station for those Americans trapped by their heritage in the hopelessness of poverty. OEO was—and is—only designed to get these individuals to the bottom rung of the ladder, at which point the standard institutional structure of schools, jobs, and health services will take over.

For some 30 million poor Americans, hard as it is to believe, the pathways to advancement simply are not open. For these 30 million poor people, opportunity is something other people have, and which the poor cannot get.

The poor do not have the opportunity to get other than menial jobs, because they dropped out of school and cannot meet the educational requirements. The advertisements for jobs which fill the classified pages of our newspapers are, for the poor, cruel reminders of what other people can have.

The poor cannot keep up with their first-grade classmates, because no one has ever read to them, they have never seen a doctor or dentist, and have lived on bad food. Forty percent of poor children, for example, have identified a picture of a teddy bear as a picture of a rat—for they are more familiar with the rodent than with the toy.

The poor cannot hold jobs, because they are sicker more often and when sick, are sicker longer because they cannot afford medical treatment. Influenza, tuberculosis, dysentery—these are illnesses poor Americans live with.

The elderly poor often live out their years in loneliness and frustration, not knowing what is available for them in benefits and services. The unheated interiors of dark rooms are the last horizons of far to many of our elderly poor.

The poor never know what jobs are open, and that job training is often available as an assist in getting the jobs. The poor are simply outside the stream of communication and information most Americans take as universal.

OEO's programs are an attempt to change all this—an attempt to open up broad new avenues of opportunity to advancement.

The remarkable successes of this bold attempt are a matter of record. This record is, unfortunately, obscured all too often by wild charges and accusations—but it nevertheless is there.

I want to cite just a few examples of this impressive record, compiled in just two and a half years.

JOB CORPS

More than 70,000 young men and women have been enrolled in the Job Corps since its inception, in either the 83 conservation centers or the 26 urban centers. Of the total enrollees, including those who did not complete the course, fully 70 percent are placed in

jobs, schools, or the military. This is an astonishingly high figure, when one takes into account that the Job Corps works on the hardcore, poor unemployed youth of America. In carrying out the tough task it has set for itself, the Job Corps has made extensive use of private industry. Of the 26 urban centers, for example, all but four are actually operated by some of America's largest industries, such as IBM, Ford, Xerox, and Litton Industries. In the instance of the Job Corps, OEO is a catalyst—it has provided a mechanism for our unemployed youth to reach the bottom rung of the ladder of advancement, and in doing so has opened the doors of employment in some of our most modern industries.

HEADSTART

In 1967, Headstart will involve nearly 700,000 four- and five-year-old children. For these children, Headstart means a medical examination, it means a hot meal a day, and, most important, it means educational preparation for entering the regular school system. Most children of poor families begin school with two strikes against them; Headstart is an attempt to eliminate this penalty.

NEIGHBORHOOD HEALTH CENTERS

By the end of fiscal year 1967, OEO had funded 35 neighborhood health centers, bringing to those neighborhoods in which the centers operate a revolution in health care.

The poor simply do not get even the rudimentary health care most Americans take for granted. Fifty percent of poor children, for example, do not receive adequate smallpox and measles immunizations. Sixty-four percent of poor children have never seen a dentist. Forty-four percent of all women who have babies in public hospitals have no prenatal care. For poor people, the chance of dying before reaching age 35 is four times higher than for better-off Americans.

It was knowledge of this situation which led me last year to propose the amendment to the OEO bill which authorized the neighborhood health center program within the framework of the community action program. I have been gratified by the response my amendment has generated, because I have seen what the centers have been able to do for poor Americans.

Let me cite a few examples.

In families with incomes under \$4,000, less than 60 percent sought out a doctor even once during the last year. But in Denver, where a neighborhood health center is operating, 85 percent of the people in the target area saw a doctor, and in Boston, where a center is located in the Columbia Point public housing project, 92 percent of the people saw a doctor last year. These same results carry through to more specific aspects of health care. Ninety-seven percent of low-income mothers in Columbia Point, and 85-95 percent in Denver, now receive prenatal care—contrasted with the only 44 percent of poor mothers nationwide. Less than 11 percent of poor children under 15 years old, nationwide, saw a pediatrician last year. But in Boston and Denver, as a result of the neighborhood health

center, 95 percent and 85-95 percent, respectively, saw a pediatrician.

There is one other noteworthy aspect of the impact of neighborhood health centers. Poor people, with no access to family physicians, use the emergency rooms as a family clinic, which, as many hospital administrators have testified, is a disruption to the ordinary hospital services. The dramatic impact on this use of the emergency rooms in New York City, in the vicinity of the Gouverneur Health Center, is illustrated by a series of statistics: in 1961, emergency room visits totaled 26,000; in 1962, 30,000; in 1963, 31,000; and in 1964, 32,000. Then in 1966, when the health center began operation, the emergency room visits began dropping, and in the first full year of operation, 1966, was down to 26,000. This indicates to me that the neighborhood health centers, while bringing a new order of life to the poor, have the side effect of improving the operation of our hospitals.

The guidelines and regulations for the neighborhood health center program were available only in mid-February of this year, which means that they have been circulated for only 6 months. Yet more than 100 formal applications for neighborhood health centers have been received in OEO's office. Unfortunately, OEO has programed only \$15 to \$20 million for the inception of 10 to 15 new centers in fiscal year 1968, the remainder of the \$60 million being used for refunding of existing centers. While we all know the pressures of the Federal budget, we will surely have difficulty justifying to the doctors and mayors who want to get health centers why they must be turned down—and justifying to the poor why they must continue to be denied the rudiments of medical care.

It has also been gratifying to see the support and involvement of the medical profession. Dr. Harold Margulies, assistant director of the AMA's Division of Socioeconomic Activities, said this about the health centers:

I think it is eminently correct that this be part of the OEO program. . . . This is something which the AMA looks to with great warmth, to which the AMA is pledging full cooperation, and for which we think there is a very good future.

Last year's AMA president, Dr. Charles Hudson, also supported the health centers, and these two doctors stand out in contrast to this year's president, Dr. Milford Rouse. It is Dr. Rouse who made the incredible statement that health care is not a right, but is a privilege for those who can afford it. I think we can all be sure that Dr. Rouse did not speak for a majority of American doctors when he said that.

For example, in California, the medical and dental societies actually operate two health centers; in Chicago, three health centers are being operated by community hospitals, whose policies are determined by the local board of health and the doctors who comprise the staffs. And there are many other examples of the close involvement of the medical profession with this program.

Further, OEO, the Surgeon General, and the Public Health Service work jointly on the program, and it has the

enthusiastic support of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In short, the neighborhood health center program has, like Headstart, filled a void in opportunities available to the poor. This month OEO announced that a health center would begin operation in Watts, to serve 30,000 people out of the 350,000—half the population of San Francisco—who live in Watts. The Neighborhood Health Council has indicated that it wants to begin with other health centers very soon, because people from other areas of Watts want the same opportunity to have their illnesses treated. The need is vast—but the available funds are few. This is in no small way one of the reasons for the unfulfilled expectations of so many of the people living in poverty, in our urban ghettos and in our rural areas.

There are many other aspects of the poverty program which have made important inroads into the lack of opportunities open to poor Americans. The migrant worker programs, the work experience programs, the legal services program, VISTA—all these and more have brought the new light of hope to dim lives.

The Employment, Manpower, and Poverty Subcommittee, chaired by the distinguished and hard-working senior Senator from Pennsylvania, has undertaken an extensive and comprehensive examination of all phases of the poverty program. Senator CLARK's presentations to the Senate have detailed the scope of this examination, and I will not repeat it except for his conclusion: That the examination has shown the need to continue OEO in existence, while working some changes in the statute. That is what the bill before us does: Works the changes the examination has shown need to be made, while continuing the poverty program in existence for another 2 years.

It was my privilege to chair 2 days of hearings in Massachusetts, as part of the nationwide examination being carried out by the Employment, Manpower, and Poverty Subcommittee. In those 2 days, we heard from witnesses in Boston, Springfield, and New Bedford, as well as inspecting the Rodman Job Corps Camp outside New Bedford. To be sure, we heard criticism of the poverty program during the nearly 15 hours of testimony—but the criticism was directed not at the concepts governing the design of the component programs. Neither was it directed at the operation of OEO. What it was directed at, in general, was the disparity between the tremendous needs of the poor and the funds available to operate OEO programs. This can hardly be called a criticism of the poverty program, as we have it before us in this Chamber.

But there are areas in which legislative changes are needed, areas in which the committee has acted on the basis of its thorough examination.

There are three basic areas of change I want to discuss briefly, as most others have been thoroughly covered either by the distinguished floor manager of the bill, or else by other Senators.

These three areas are health of the

poor, the elderly poor, and neighborhood organizations.

HEALTH OF THE POOR

The existing legislation authorizing neighborhood health centers has, as I have pointed out, generated an overwhelming and enthusiastic response from communities across the country. I think it unfortunate that this demand cannot be satisfied, but we have at least made a beginning.

I have already cited many of the deficiencies in health services available to the poor, the deficiencies which neighborhood health centers are designed to overcome. But there is another and critical deficiency in health services for the poor—the availability of health personnel skilled in the special needs of the poor. To overcome this deficiency, I introduced an amendment to the bill in committee, which now appears as section 221(b) (3) (B).

This amendment authorizes the provision of financial assistance to public agencies and private organizations, and to individuals, for programs and projects designed to develop knowledge and to enhance skills in the provision of health services for the poor.

There is an acute shortage of doctors and other qualified health professionals trained for and concerned about the provision of health services to the poor. Experience with the promising development of neighborhood health centers, located in areas populated largely by poor people, has revealed a need for more qualified personnel. The basic purpose of the amendment is to induce a many-sided effort to help overcome this shortage.

The testimony given to the subcommittee, during this examination of the poverty program and the needs it is designed to fill, confirm the need for this specialized training. For example, Dr. Joel Alpert, medical director of the Family Health Care program at the Harvard Medical School, said this to our subcommittee:

I do not believe that we presently possess the necessary body of knowledge that enables us to deliver care in the community. I hope that the patient care field would have the same characteristic development of fellowship programs as has characterized [other health specialties]. Fellowship training provides the physician with the opportunity, beyond residency, or in place of residency, to acquire the needed skills. . . . I say this because at the moment, members of various programs being developed under the Poverty Program require staffing by physicians who are not presently available, let alone specially trained or appropriately trained to provide this care. I plead for the development of fellowship programs which would not only enable physicians to acquire these necessary skills, but would serve as a focus to attract physicians to the provision of patient care as an exciting and appropriate career.

This testimony I found compelling, persuasive, and, when joined with other material, amply sufficient to justify the Amendment I offered.

The problem of providing health services for the poor involves four related issues: First, developing institutional arrangements and services which would be more responsive to the needs of the

poor; second, training personnel equipped to help develop programs for reaching the poor with health services; third, training health personnel to serve in such programs; and fourth, developing educational facilities to provide such personnel with specialized training.

The connection between poor health and poverty is now beginning to receive the active attention it has long warranted. The relationship between poverty and lack of education is acknowledged, and is being acted on in various ways. It is my belief that the provision of health services to the poor requires special, new approaches, just as education for the poor does. Education and good health are utterly fundamental to all change of social and economic status. This is true of the less-developed countries of the world, and it is true of the less-developed areas of our own country. Without this fundamental equipment, there is no opportunity for the poor to gain full membership in our society.

The overall objective of the amendment, therefore, is twofold: First, to encourage the entry of larger numbers of people into the health science professions from among the most deprived sections of the population; and second, to help in their training by improving and expanding existing training facilities, with special emphasis on preparation for the provision of health services to the poor.

In order to recruit students for the health science professions, a series of intensive educational measures must be taken. With rare exceptions, the poor cannot now qualify adequately for professional schools because family background and previous educational experience do not prepare them for the demands of the school work, or for sustaining the necessary motivation.

While medicine, dentistry and nursing have been classic fields for social mobility in this country, this situation is changing, especially among the Negro population. Negro students can now choose among many vocations offering quick changes in economic and social status, as compared with the longer training required for such professions as medicine and even dentistry. Although the number of Negro physicians increased by 37.6 percent between 1950 and 1960, the representation of Negroes in the medical profession actually fell in comparison with their representation in other professions. In 1950, Negro physicians constituted 2.0 percent of all Negroes in the professions; by 1960, this figure had fallen to 1.7 percent.

Any program to increase the number of health professionals drawn from the ranks of the poor, Negro and white alike, must deal with the problems in depth and will probably require a commitment to upgrading educational opportunities offered Negro and other deprived students at all levels, especially at the high school and college levels. This amendment authorizes a beginning of such efforts for poor students intending to enter the health professions.

Such a program requires financial support both for institutions and individuals. It should be a flexible, pioneer-

ing program, putting emphasis on these four factors; training people to participate in organizing new and more effective means of delivery of medical services for the poor; recruiting and training health personnel for such services; assisting institutions in which personnel can be trained to enter and to work in the field in a variety of capacities and at variety of levels; providing a stimulus to advanced training, and to research in all aspects of the problem.

The amendment would authorize OEO to take the following steps:

First. To provide by grant, contract, or otherwise for educational exchanges, and for studies, research, and instruction and for other educational activities intended to develop knowledge or skills in the field of health services for the poor. Provision could be made to support research and development in methods of delivering health services to the poor; to assist in the establishment, expansion, and maintenance of educational and training courses concerned with community health care, with special emphasis on health care for the poor; and to foster studies through professorships, lectureships, institutes, conferences, seminars, and courses in such subjects as are necessary to encourage concern with and improve knowledge of the health and other disciplines associated with the provision and delivery of health care for the poor.

Second. To initiate a series of stipends or fellowships designed to encourage and support both prospective and senior health professionals in obtaining education, experience and training in the area of the health sciences. A first concern would be with regard to students who would prepare to enter the stream of education leading into health professions. For professionals, the primary concern would be to provide practical experience specifically in the innovative forms of delivery of health services to the poor, which would be augmented by academic studies in a professional school affiliated with such services or in one which offers courses relevant to the field experience undertaken.

Third. Funds available for programs under this amendment would be available for orientation courses or other appropriate services and materials for poor persons intent upon entering fields related to the purposes of this amendment, whether or not they are receiving other financial support from the Government; and to provide or continue services to increase the effectiveness of the programs following the completion of the fellowship term.

Fourth. For the purpose of assisting recipients of stipends to make the best possible use of their opportunities and assisting them in directing their talents and initiative into channels which will make them more effective leaders, teachers, advisers, and workers in the field of health care for the poor, suitable arrangements may be made for the establishment of an adequate counseling service at training centers and appropriate colleges and universities.

Fifth. The stipends or fellowships could be financed, administered, and

awarded by OEO with private organizations, notably foundations and academic institutions. Private organizations, firms, licensing boards, professional associations, agencies, international organizations, foundations, academic institutions, and private individuals should be encouraged to participate to the maximum extent feasible in carrying out this amendment, and to make contributions of funds, property, and services which would be acceptable to be utilized to carry out the purposes of this amendment. And, of course, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is directed to work closely with OEO in the administration of the amendment.

Sixth. Stipends would be of several varieties related to the educational and experimental status of the candidate. I would contemplate that the varieties would include: First, one category of stipend for students undertaking education in disciplines leading to professional training in the health science professions. The second category for students in professional schools who would be preparing for service in the health professions. I hope that recipients of these stipends would spend a period of weeks, or months, up to 1 year—with the approval of professional schools—in a community health service. The third category would be for students who have just completed their medical or other graduate health professional training; the stipend would be for 1 year of service in a community health facility augmented by academic work in a recognized medical professional school. A fourth category would provide fellowships for graduate physicians or other health professionals at the point in training where resident specialties are undertaken, and in this instance the training would be equivalent to specialization in community health work, would be for longer than 1 year, and would include tours of duty in neighborhood health facilities in both urban and rural settings, in Job Corps camps and in VISTA centers. A fifth category would be for physicians or others with experience in private practice who would undertake 1 year's work in community service augmented by academic work. A sixth category would be for members of medical or other health related disciplines who would do research in, or widen their experience of, or give technical assistance to, community health facilities.

Seventh. Categories would vary, as would the stipends, depending on time involved, educational and professional status and experience, numbers of dependents, cost-of-living factors, and so forth.

OEO and the Department of HEW are directed to work closely together in the development of this new program. It involves expertise common to both agencies, and both have indicated to me their willingness to begin in this fashion, with OEO given the main responsibility because of its expertise in the specific field of health care of the poor. In testimony before the subcommittee on the poverty legislation, the HEW spokesman, Assistant Secretary Lisle Carter, spoke of the close working relationship between

HEW and OEO in the respective health programs of each, and cited numerous examples of joint funding and supervision.

In the health area, at least, there is close cooperation and coordination among the Federal agencies, a development calculated to bring better care to the poor. I applaud the personnel involved in making this cooperation effective.

The amendment grew out of the experience of OEO in funding summer projects involving health care for the poor in three areas across the country: California, Chicago, and New York City.

The three programs represent the most ambitious activity to date of a growing sector of the health student community: The Student Health Organizations. Student Health Organizations—SHO—have appeared over the past 3 years in major cities across the Nation. Composed of students from all of the health sciences, and seeking the advice of prominent professional and community leaders, the organizations have carried out numerous projects designed to foster leadership through service, experience and education. The SHO's have introduced the notion that the health science student, during his educational tenure, is an untapped resource for alleviating the health manpower shortage crisis in the United States. The possibility and desirability that health students might actively participate in community services while they receive their education has been a major SHO contribution. The SHO's have emphasized the importance of mobilizing students to explore creative and flexible new roles in conjunction with the public and the professions.

The value of such an approach was clearly demonstrated in the student health project of 1966, a program funded by OEO and jointly sponsored by the USC School of Medicine and the Student Medical Conference of Los Angeles. Through the 1966 project, 90 students of nursing, medicine, dentistry, dental hygiene and social work from 40 institutions in 11 States served in various capacities in poverty areas across the State of California. Each student consulted directly with a preceptor who was involved in some way with health concerns and disadvantaged populations. Students were joined in their work by 15 community workers, individuals with marginal incomes who received the same stipend as the students.

The success of the 1966 project laid a firm foundation for the program planned for summer 1967, which has been an even greater success than the 1966 project. One hundred fifty students from all health disciplines were joined by 50 community workers and teenage health "interns" in placements throughout the State of California. Student fellows were placed in one of three areas in California. Those in the northern and southern parts of the State worked in poverty-stricken urban communities. Students in the central part of California were placed in rural settings. The project fellows worked in interdisciplinary teams combining students to medicine, dentistry, nursing, social work, and other

health-related fields. Project fellows concentrated in well-defined communities in order to maximize their impact upon the community and to insure, as far as possible, that the life of the programs they developed lived beyond the summer's end.

It is against this background that the 1967 Chicago student health project was constructed.

The Chicago project focused on the problems of health and health care among the urban poor. All 100 students—including medical, nursing, dental, social work and law—worked within the city of Chicago. Placements were in Negro, Puerto Rican, Appalachian white, and Mexican-American areas. The assignments ranged from community organization around health issues, with local groups in the city's most troubled areas, to university research positions studying patterns of delivery of health care to these same regions. There were placements with Headstart schools, Chicago Board of Health facilities, Neighborhood Health Centers, university and city outpatient departments and private physicians.

In addition to the 100 health science students, the project included 50 salaried interns—16- and 17-year-old high school students from Neighborhood Youth Corps programs in areas in question. The interns worked alongside the health science students, in the same placements, as integral parts of the team.

The New York City project, operated in the South Bronx, is similar. In this area 50 health professional students and 10 community workers were concentrated this summer from June 27 through September 1. The group was drawn from the nursing, medical, dental and social work disciplines. They worked to encourage and support community efforts to deliver better health care and to effect a substantial change in medical service. The idea of maintaining continuity, that is, of training residents of the South Bronx to fill the jobs created by student fellows during the summer, was paramount in the project's outlook. The sponsors of the project, Albert Einstein College of Medicine and Montefiore Hospital, were instrumental in assuring the broad based community support.

An article in the September 25, 1967, edition of the AMA News contains a vivid description of the accomplishments of these summer medical students projects "in improving the health conditions in ghetto areas of cities." I commend this article to those who wonder about the AMA's position on this amendment.

In short, the amendment will supplement and complement the great success of the Neighborhood Health Centers and can help make Aristotle's statement in "Politics" an American boast:

Health of mind and body is so fundamental to the good life that if we believe that men have any personal rights at all as human beings, then they have an absolute moral right to such a measure of good health as society and society alone is able to give them.

ELDERLY POOR
The elderly poor is the second major area I want to discuss.

The elderly poor, as a group, have

been least affected by the general economic progress made since 1959—the earliest year for which we have comparable data. For example, in 1959, there were fewer elderly poor individuals than there are now: 2.5 million then, versus 2.7 million now.

Today, about six out of every 10 unrelated aged are poor. Today, one out of every five seniors living in a family is poor. But only one out of nine persons age 18 to 64, in families, is poor. Thirty percent of all the elderly in the United States are poor, in contrast to 17 percent for the total U.S. population. The problem is particularly acute in rural areas. Eighty percent of the poor living alone in rural areas are over 55, as opposed to 68 percent in urban areas.

We, as a nation with a gross national product approaching \$800 billion, should simply not tolerate poverty among our senior citizens. For one thing, most senior citizens have played their role in building our society—and they should have recognition for this from us, the beneficiaries of their efforts. For another, we can ease the pains of poverty and the loneliness it brings to seniors without a massive financial expenditure.

Strong evidence that this is so is readily available. In 1966, hearings in the Federal, State and Community Services Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, of the Special Committee on Aging, reviewed the successes of the OEO-funded medicare alert program, under which 12,000 seniors in 466 different projects sought out other seniors and informed them of their rights under the recently enacted medicare program. The subcommittee issued a report recommending that the program be continued and expanded, building upon the enthusiasm of medicare alert. The National Council on the Aging responded, applying to OEO for funding of what it called Project Find, and OEO has, happily, funded the project.

What these two efforts have discovered is that the hundreds of thousands of seniors who have been reached by the projects care about such basic human services as nutritious food, better housing, regaining contact with a society which has passed them by, learning about their rights under Federal, State and local aid programs, employment, recreation and other aspects of American life. They care about them because they are not presently receiving them. The projects have also successfully demonstrated that seniors themselves can plan effective and efficient roles as staff workers in the projects, operating under specific plans of action.

The testimony presented to the subcommittee confirms this. Representatives of many organizations spoke before the subcommittee, but few were as eloquent or as compelling as those from organizations of seniors.

Jack Ossosky of the National Council on Aging said, for example:

But what of those fathers of generations past? They, the poor who have grown old and the old who have grown poor. They, too, need the chance for a better life embodied in the promise of the War Against Poverty, and this need is urgent, for their future is now.

John Edelman, president of the National Council of Senior Citizens, said:

The report [on Project Find] showed that among the 388 older persons interviewed, thirty-six percent were entitled to public assistance they were not getting, forty-seven percent were entitled to United States food stamps they were not buying, and forty-eight percent appeared eligible for Medicaid but had no information about this benefit.

And William Hutton, executive director of the National Council for Senior Citizens, said:

We should also make available to seniors a variety of other options, like the opportunity to continue working, to launch upon a second career, to engage in part-time or full-time study, or simply to continue working at a gradually decreasing work schedule in a gradual transition from full-time production to leisure.

The testimony of these three gentlemen does not come from studies or intuition. It comes from working with older Americans, day after day and year after year. They know what the elderly poor need and they know what the elderly poor want, and it has been my experience that they reflect accurately the hopes of the many millions of seniors they represent.

For these reasons, I proposed that a national emphasis program, somewhat similar to Project Find, be adopted as part of the OEO legislation. OEO has only reluctantly, despite consistent prodding from myself and from other Members of Congress, moved toward adopting any programs designed for the elderly poor. Figures submitted to the subcommittee, at my request, clearly indicate that the funds OEO has allocated for the elderly poor are disproportionately low. This led to one of the findings of the committee:

Once again, the Committee must report an inadequate performance in programs for the elderly, and urge OEO to take immediate steps to remedy this deficiency.

It is my hope that a national emphasis program for the elderly poor can work a dramatic change in this orientation.

My amendment, appearing as section 221(b)(6), is designed to encourage local community action agencies to develop local programs employing seniors to reach out and assist other seniors, those isolated from the currents of everyday life and unaware of what health, legal, housing and other services are available to them. I have high hopes for the success of Project Find, and know that these hopes are shared by all those closely familiar with the fears and the needs of the older, retired, or widowed American.

There are a number of other changes this legislation effects which will have a salutary impact on the needs of the elderly poor. In the VISTA program, for example, OEO is directed to raise the participation of older volunteers and to develop more projects which serve the needs of older persons. Today, only 16 percent of VISTA volunteers are over 60 years of age. This is, in my opinion, a grave mistake: seniors are available, willing and able to serve; they need only to be organized and recognized. Other amendments direct that older persons should be made members of the govern-

ing board of the local community action agency and that older persons should be employed as staff members of local agencies.

In short, we have only begun to move toward doing for our elderly poor what we should do. OEO has not yet implemented the requirement in a 1966 amendment, which I offered, requiring special studies and programs for the elderly poor, but I intend to see that the studies are begun shortly and that program recommendations are forthcoming soon. Then, and only then, can we be sure that retirement years for seniors are not empty, but are full of meaning and enjoyment.

NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATIONS

Neighborhood organizations are the third major area I want to discuss. I introduced two amendments relating to neighborhood organizations: section 233, which authorizes the development of neighborhood centers; and section 219 (b), which authorizes the development of housing development and services organizations as specific delegate agencies.

Neighborhood centers are fast becoming the keystone in the arch of local antipoverty efforts. My purpose in proposing that the authorization for neighborhood centers be put into the statute is to encourage their widespread development in all communities and rural areas.

In 1968, OEO plans to fund, through local community action agencies, something on the order of 1,000 neighborhood centers, 700 urban and 300 rural, serving roughly 4 million people. These centers reflect a wide variety of forms: some are comprehensive service centers, some are referral centers, some are one-stop service centers, and some are small storefronts. But whatever the form, there is one central feature common to all: each center reflects the actual needs of the neighborhood, as expressed by the residents of the neighborhood. Thus, in some areas, legal services are in demand, and they can be made available through the center. In other areas or neighborhoods, conversely, day care or job referral may be in demand, and these services can be provided. It is this wide choice of services, a choice exercised by neighborhood residents which marks OEO's centers as distinct from those established by other agencies with a more restricted mandate.

The concept of neighborhoods as the focus of social action is deeply woven into the fabric of American urban and rural life. In the early days, life centered around the neighborhood or town churches, and later, when immigration mushroomed, it grew to include the social club.

The depression and the consequent proliferation of health, welfare and educational programs, on local, State and Federal levels, changed all this. The churches and voluntary agencies became more specialized, as public programs entered the arena, and consequently the consumer of services was forced to become quite sophisticated as to the existence and location of the private and public agencies, often spread at random throughout the community.

The need to return to a neighborhood-based, comprehensive service organiza-

tion has only recently been recognized. President Johnson, in August of 1966, asked the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to set as his goal "the establishment—in every ghetto in America—of a neighborhood center to service the people who live there." In June of 1967, a group of Federal agencies announced pilot neighborhood center projects in 14 cities, in response to the President's speech.

America will not—and need not—wait for the funds to be made available to construct brandnew centers in every ghetto. OEO has encouraged the rental of space, as opposed to costly new construction, in an effort to get the centers in operation as soon as possible.

I think the foresight of OEO in this matter is great, and the success story of these centers should be widely told. I visited two centers in Roxbury, a ghetto area in Boston, and when the rioting broke out during the summer in Roxbury, these two centers were spared, while buildings close on either side were burned out. The reason, I think, is that those centers were a visible indication that someone cared about the people of Roxbury, and cared enough to ask the people what they needed and wanted.

This program, it is important to note, does not in any way compete with that authorized by section 703 of the Housing Act of 1965—the neighborhood facilities grant program administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Rather, OEO's neighborhood center program supplements it. OEO can provide the funds for planning and operating a center; HUD supplies the construction funds. Thus, the two programs dovetail neatly.

The second amendment relating to neighborhood organizations is the inclusion, within the section encouraging the use of delegate agencies to carry out the components of the community action program, of one specific type of delegate agency—housing development and service organizations.

In the last 5 years, a number of new kinds of housing programs have become available. These programs, administered by the Federal Housing Administration, provide interest-rate subsidies for the provision of low- and moderate-income housing, and rent supplements for the provision of low-income housing. These programs require a sponsor which is either a nonprofit or limited-dividend corporation, or a cooperative organization. The sponsor itself organizes and manages the project. FHA processes the application and provides direct assistance under the program.

The results of these housing programs are paradoxical. On the one hand, the amount of money available is small. But on the other hand, available funds have not been fully utilized. The administrative and financial skills required, and the seed money needed, have simply been too much for most nonprofit groups to muster. Well intentioned and energetic though they may be, these groups have just not been able to hire the personnel or raise the money needed to bring such projects successfully to conclusion through the regulations and complications which the programs require.

Housing professionals generally agree that an upgrading of the nonprofit sponsor is necessary if such programs are ever to work. The nonprofit housing development corporation is a device often mentioned in this context. OEO has been experimenting with these corporations—through section 205 community action grants and section 207 demonstration grants—in a wide variety of situations, from the neighborhood level on the one hand, to the semiregional on the other. The housing development corporations, at the city, metropolitan, and semiregional levels, are concentrating on the "packaging" problem.

To date, OEO has funded 11 of the Housing Development Corporations, in New York City; Durham, N.C.; Cleveland, Ohio; Washington, D.C.; Baltimore, Md.; St. Louis, Mo.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Denver, Colo., and Whitesburg, Ky. OEO's financial involvement in the seven corporations which, to date, have had their mortgages committed, is \$1,900,000; the value of the housing being constructed is \$68,900,000. This is, to my mind, dramatic evidence of the multiplier effect of OEO's seed money in this area, and it convinced me that this tentative, experimental program should be made a specific part of OEO's legislation.

For housing development, these corporations bring together the lawyers, architects, real estate and construction specialists needed to prepare applications for the Federal Housing Authority and to shepherd them through the processing stages. Equally important, they provide entrepreneurial drive which the private market has yet to supply for low-income housing. Both these functions require skill and access to capital, capital which can be recovered when permanent financing is secured, but without which projects are impossible to develop. By aggregating such resources, the development corporation becomes a new base of support for other institutions. The existing nonprofit groups—churches, labor unions and civic associations—can draw on these new institutions for talents which they have been unable to muster themselves, and they in turn become the formal mortgagor entity envisaged by statute.

As one specific example of the success of OEO's experimental efforts, consider the case of the Philadelphia Housing Development Corporation in Philadelphia. OEO made a grant of \$160,000 to the Corporation, which in turn generated a \$2,000,000 revolving fund. This revolving fund then generated \$10,000,000 in mortgages in process, which translates to 850 low-income housing units actually under construction. The importance of the \$160,000 initial grant lies in the very high "front-end" cash cost which must be laid out before a mortgage can be obtained. Many Federal housing programs are so complex that architects, real-estate experts, lawyers, administrators, and finance men all must be consulted before an application can even be drawn up. This front-end cost has forced many nonprofit sponsors to shy away from using the low-income housing programs. But when the front-end cost can be ob-

tained, then these local sponsors have little difficulty in borrowing the remaining costs.

My amendment, then, simply encourages the creation of the local institutional structure with which the Government can deal. In his testimony, the Director of OEO, Sargent Shriver, described the need for this local structure in these terms:

Our government and society is so set up that unless a fellow has got the right kind of a catcher's mitt, he cannot even get the ball the other guy is throwing.

Now, with this amendment, catcher's mitts will be available.

In short, what I have tried to do is to strengthen the role of the neighborhood-based organization in the poverty program. The neighborhood is the right place, in my mind, for services for the poor—who only rarely have transportation—to be made available. It is my hope that the progress OEO has already made in this direction will be accelerated.

INCREASE IN COMMUNITY ACTION FUNDS

I would like to explain, briefly, one other amendment. The committee added a number of new programs to title II of the OEO legislation, including Project Find. It is my belief that the authorization should consequently be raised to reflect the addition of these new items, and not held down to the level requested when these programs were not part of the legislation. Consequently, I offered an amendment to raise the authorization for title II by \$40 million.

EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT

I consider the Emergency Employment Act of 1967, recommended by the committee, landmark legislation. We now have, as the lucid two-page statement in the report accompanying the bill indicates, the opportunity to vote on a measure recommended by three different Presidential commissions, by the urban coalition, and endorsed by almost seven out of 10 Americans. If the need for this measure is so clear to Presidential panels and to the American public alike, I fail to see how the Senate can, in conscience, do anything but accept it.

Can we be so indifferent to the call of need? Can we ignore the lessons of the past two summers? Can we be unmindful of the pressures operating in our slums?

I believe that the perspective of history will reveal the vote on the Emergency Employment Act as a measure of the concern of the U.S. Senate for the well-being of our national life. I also believe that those who vote against it are voting against the best interests of the Nation and of its people. There can be no viable American society so long as jobs, and the income they produce, are denied to those men and women who want to work.

I would also make the point that this is an authorization bill and not an appropriations bill. Consequently, voting to accept the Emergency Employment Act as recommended by the committee will not cost anyone so much as a dime. What it will show, however, is that the U.S. Senate is not unaware or unmindful of the recommendations of some of this country's best minds, as well as 70 percent of its people.

When riots occur, the national conscience is shocked. Yet voices have for years warned that urban ghettos are crucibles of discontent and alienation, and breeding grounds for violent outbreaks of frustration. These same voices say that employment is, among young men, the single most important factor in soothing the frustrations.

What do riots cost? We can, perhaps, measure the cost in dollars and cents of physical damage. But can we ever measure the cost in national prestige? In lives? In young men and women who will never feel the same about the American way of life? In the willingness of small businessmen to locate in ghettos?

What the Emergency Employment Act does is to authorize \$2.8 billion spread over 2 fiscal years, 1968 and 1969, to create public service jobs. This is a small price to pay, I think, when stacked up against the true costs of past or possible future riots. It is, too, pale in comparison to the space budget, the Federal highway budget, or to many others.

We should ask ourselves, what will be the cost of delaying a year in sending a man to the moon? Or, what will be the cost of delaying for a year a few miles of urban freeway?

This is the frame of reference for debate on this bill. We are talking not about a capital investment in physical facilities—we are talking about a capital investment in human beings. These human beings are not passive, and it is they who will make or break the future of this country. If there is any clear message of the past two summers, I think it is that our investment, to date, in human beings, has been far too small. The gulf between the affluent American and the poor American is widening—and it is this gulf which has rubbed raw the sores of 300 years of deprivation.

CONCLUSION

There is one last area I would like to discuss—the issue of control of the program. "Increase local control; untie the Federal strings"—how often have we heard that cry? Yet, when charges were leveled this summer that local poverty workers were involved in the riots, these same critics cried: "Tighten up the controls." Now, let me ask: When will these critics make up their minds? For we cannot have it both ways. We cannot tighten Federal controls and loosen them at the same time.

I, for one, have made up mine: I think the local control in design and operation of poverty programs is unprecedented in extent and crucial to its success. Poverty is simply not subject to the contours of a grand design; the poverty program, in this regard, is totally different from the Federal highway program, which is susceptible to national standards and criteria. I think the extent of local control is important and meaningful, and I reject out of hand the assertion that the program is controlled in Washington, and that local programs cannot show initiative.

The poverty program is without parallel as an innovative Federal effort at unraveling a problem as complex as society itself. I am, as one who participated in the development of the initial

program and the subsequent years' amendments, proud of what it has done. I know the road ahead is long and difficult, but I think the changes made in this year's bill are constructive and will help us down that road with firm conviction and deliberate speed.

Mr. President, I would like once again to express my admiration for the work of the distinguished floor manager of the bill [Mr. CLARK]. He is in no small measure personally responsible for the vast amount of thought which went into the development of this bill, and I commend him for his leadership.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the senior Senator from Massachusetts for his fine statement.

Senator KENNEDY's aid and support throughout the subcommittee's examination of the war on poverty were notable. Senator KENNEDY held extensive hearings in Massachusetts. He was particularly helpful in the subcommittee's hearings of administration witnesses and in drawing up the legislation which is now pending.

Senator KENNEDY's amendments in the areas of health, housing, neighborhood centers, and the elderly have greatly strengthened the bill and the poverty program.

I thank the Senator for his support and his kind comments.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLINGS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the Ribicoff-Percy amendment to the instructions of the motion of the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and all amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the proponents of the amendment and the junior Senator from West Virginia, the sponsor of the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 367.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment (No. 367) offered by Mr. RIBICOFF, for himself and Mr. PERCY.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 367) is as follows:

In lieu of the motion by Mr. BYRD of West Virginia to strike out title II, I move to strike

title II and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE II—EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT

"SHORT TITLE

"Sec. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Emergency Employment Act of 1967'.

"FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

"Sec. 202. (a) The Congress finds that certain communities and areas in the Nation are presently burdened by severe unemployment and underemployment. Such areas contain large concentrations or proportions of persons who are unable to obtain jobs in regular competitive employment because of lack of education, occupational skill, or work experience and because of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement. This situation is aggravated by migration of unskilled rural residents to urban areas. Many of the affected areas are doubly handicapped by the lack of sufficient jobs for all the potential labor force. This condition is destructive of human dignity and results in a loss of national productivity. In many localities the problem has reached crisis proportion by contributing to social unrest and civil disorder.

"(b) At the same time there is a huge backlog of need for additional public services and public facilities in such fields as those which (1) contribute to the development of human potential, (2) better the conditions under which people live, learn, and work, and (3) aid in the development and conservation of natural resources.

"(c) Therefore, it is the purpose of this title to provide meaningful employment opportunities in public service and other activities which will relieve severe unemployment in urban and rural areas and contribute to the national interest by fulfilling unmet needs.

"ELIGIBLE AREAS

"Sec. 203. The Secretary of Labor (hereafter referred to as the 'Secretary') shall designate urban and rural areas to be eligible for assistance under this title. Such areas shall contain a high concentration or proportion of low-income families and individuals and shall have severe problems of unemployment and underemployment. They may be defined without regard to political boundaries.

"FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

"Sec. 204. (a) The Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance to public agencies and private organizations for part or all of the costs of programs which create meaningful public service and other employment opportunities. He shall adopt procedures to assure (1) that there is maximum emphasis on local initiative and responsibility with full participation of and maximum cooperation among local public officials, residents of eligible areas, and representatives of private organizations in the establishment of programs under this title, including, without limitation, the determination of areas and participants eligible for assistance and the selection of projects under subsection (b) of this section, and (2) that such assistance is fully coordinated with programs operated under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, and other relevant Federal Acts.

"(b) Jobs created or made available under this title may include services and supporting facilities in such fields as health, public safety, education, recreation, streets, parks and municipal maintenance, housing and neighborhood improvement, conservation and rural development, beautification, and other fields of human betterment and public improvement. Such jobs shall

include (1) those which can be made available immediately to persons who are otherwise unable to obtain employment, (2) those which provide placement resources for persons completing training under titles I and V of the Economic Opportunity Act and other relevant manpower training programs, and (3) those which use the skills of unemployed persons in areas with a chronic labor surplus. Priority shall be given to projects which are labor intensive in character.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance to assure that (1) persons employed in jobs created by this title are provided opportunity for further education, training, and necessary supportive services, including those provided by other relevant Acts, so that they may be prepared to obtain regular competitive employment in the future; and (2) that maximum effort is made to encourage private employers to adopt innovative approaches which create additional jobs and new types of careers for low-income and disadvantaged persons.

"LOANS

"Sec. 205. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make loans to public and private agencies for the purchase of supplies and equipment which support and supplement projects carried out by participants under section 204.

"(b) Loans authorized under this section may be made without interest and under such other terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe.

"ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS

"Sec. 206. Participants in programs under this title must be unemployed or low-income persons who reside in eligible areas and who meet other criteria prescribed by the Secretary. Low income shall be defined in terms of section 125 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

"SPECIAL CONDITIONS

"Sec. 207. (a) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this title unless he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

"(1) no participant will be employed on projects involving political parties, or the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

"(2) the program will not result in displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services, or result in the substitution of Federal for other funds in connection with work that would otherwise be performed;

"(3) wages paid a participant shall not be lower than, whichever is the highest of (A) the minimum wage which would be applicable to the employment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 if section 6 of such Act applied to the participant and he was not exempt under section 13 thereof, (B) the State or local minimum wage for the most nearly comparable covered employment, or (C) the prevailing rate of wages in the area for similar work.

"(4) the program will, to the extent appropriate, contribute to the occupational development or upward mobility of individual participants.

"(b) For programs related to physical improvements preference shall be given to those improvements which will be substantially used by low-income persons and families in urban neighborhoods or rural areas having concentrations or proportions of low-income persons and families.

"(c) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to assure that programs under this title have adequate internal administrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel standards, evaluation procedures, and other policies as may be necessary to promote the effective use of funds.

"(d) Programs approved under this title

shall, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the elimination of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement, including civil service requirements which restrict employment opportunities for the disadvantaged.

"REPORTS

"Sec. 208. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report on the progress made in implementing this title and suggestions for improvements on or before May 15, 1968, November 15, 1968, and on or before May 15 and November 15 of each year thereafter.

"EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT FUND

"Sec. 209. There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States an Emergency Employment Fund. To provide capital for such fund, the President is authorized to allocate to such fund an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the funds appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, which are determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to be available to carry out Federal programs which are not directly and primarily related to the national defense. Sums so allocated to such fund shall be available to the Secretary to carry out the purposes of this title."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia renew his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, while the creation of an emergency employment program has my enthusiastic support, I believe we can accomplish this goal without spending any additional Federal money.

Amendment No. 367, which the junior Senator from Illinois has cosponsored with me, authorizes the President to transfer up to 2 percent of nondefense moneys from the current budget into an emergency employment fund.

The 1968 budget calls for \$55 billion in nondefense spending. Two percent of this sum would yield \$1.1 billion—the amount that title II of S. 2388 would authorize each year to create employment opportunities in public service areas.

Mr. President, the most obvious fact in America is that a good job at an adequate wage is the key to providing self-respect for an individual and progress for a nation.

Yet unemployment in our central cities is twice the national rate. A recent Labor Department survey of 10 big city slums showed that 1 of every 3 persons was unable to earn a living. The same study also found that unemployment among Negroes between the ages of 16 and 19 was as high as 40 percent.

If this severe employment problem existed at a time when there were no tasks waiting to be performed, no jobs that needed to be done, that would be one thing. But that is not the case.

There are today a total of 5.3 million potential jobs in the public service field alone, according to the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

Under the provisions of title II, meaningful employment opportunities would be provided in such fields as health, recreation, public safety, education, beautification, municipal services, and neighborhood development and improvement.

Jobs are the number one priority in America today. Survey after survey proves that much of the violence that has struck our cities stems from unemployment, and that disorder often comes from persons who feel they have no stake in society.

However, this is also a time when our national financial commitments are strained to the utmost. It is obvious that Congress and the executive branch are in no mood to vote additional expenditures. But the need for jobs is our No. 1 priority. Other expenditures can be deferred. I am sure that 2 percent can be found in items of less priority in the domestic budget. Here is an opportunity to give priority where the need is greatest.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the issue before us is a very simple one. Hardly a day goes by that we do not hear either from an urban specialist or academician, a mayor, or a ghetto resident that an immediate priority in our urban areas is jobs. And who amongst us can deny this? Is not man's most valuable asset his ability to find and maintain meaningful employment? At the present time there are 3 million able-bodied men and women on the streets of America looking for jobs, but it is a hopeless search for the jobs which they seek and are prepared to fill do not exist. Ironically, at the same time, there are millions of positions going begging for lack of adequately trained persons to fill them. The frustrations to the community as a whole and the indignities to the person as an individual that this situation engenders are obvious. I need not repeat them here.

Even the most ardent supporter of title II of the bill under consideration will admit that it does not offer the final or long range solution to the unemployment problems of our nation. As a realistic advocate of the program I argue that we have an emergency situation to deal with as well as a long term one.

This program is, as its name implies, an emergency program. It should be judged on those terms. I do not advocate that it take the place of existing or future long range programs.

I am certain that everyone in this Chamber knows the value of manpower training and retraining and most of us realize what a tangled mess the Federal manpower programs are now in. There presently exist over 79 Federal training and education programs administered by 15 different agencies and bureaus. The real tragedy is that one finds example after example of completely uncoordinated training programs and of men and women training for jobs which do not exist. Welfare mothers tell me stories of leaving their children home alone at night in order to participate in a Federal training program and then, after graduation, not being able to find work in the field for which they have prepared themselves at government suggestion. Others tell of taking basic education courses which bring them up to a sixth-grade level in reading and writing, but then discovering that a ninth grade

literacy level is needed to qualify for a job training program.

In not assuring that these programs are properly and efficiently administered this Congress and, to a greater degree, this administration is guilty of dashing untold numbers of personal dreams and ambitions on the part of low-income citizens. In a real sense the Great Society has failed its people. Now it must begin to make up for this failure by giving some of its citizens a little extra help.

The emergency job program will do just this. It will give an extra boost to those who need it the most. This program offers much more than a job and a steady income. The program, by providing employment, offers dignity to the individual, stability to the family and hope to the community.

All this being so, is it too much to ask that this administration accept the emergency job program as a priority and cut back on other less pressing, less immediate and less efficient programs? I think not.

The amendment which Senator RIBICOFF and I have offered today would give the President the authority to set the priorities in his administration by cutting back some less important programs. He would be authorized to use up to \$1.1 billion of the resultant savings the first year to fund the Emergency Employment Act.

As strongly as I believe that such a job program is necessary I just as strongly believe it would be wrong for us to authorize an additional \$2.8 billion at this time even for so high a priority item as jobs. With a projected deficit of \$25 to \$30 billion and with full proposed 10 percent surcharge which would bring in less than \$5 billion this fiscal year, we have no choice but to pull in our belts. An average American family of four with a \$7,000 income could certainly cut back 2 percent of their budget, or \$116, if necessary to meet a new urgent need rather than just spending its money adding to its debt. Why should we not do the same thing in government?

If we do not, the resultant inflation will impose a stiff penalty on millions of American families, acting most harshly, as inflation does, on the poor.

With a \$135 billion budget, no one can argue that there is not plenty of room to tighten our fiscal belts. This Government is like so many Americans—it keeps talking about going on a diet, but it is all talk for the scales never show a loss of weight. Every year the President promises economies and every year we have a larger and larger budget. The more we talk about dieting, the fatter it gets.

The President often criticizes the Congress for not permitting him to economize. Let us say to the President—we now authorize you to cut back 2 percent on nondefense spending and to use these funds to meet an emergency situation in our Nation. Let us assure him that the American people are willing to economize on other important programs in order to help those in our midst who need emergency assistance.

Mr. President, not just as Senators, but as Americans, let us wake up to the need and set our priorities. What is more

important than the dignity and fulfillment of meaningful employment?

I therefore, Mr. President, offer co-sponsorship and support for the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut which is now before the Senate, as a possible means of meeting this emergency situation by providing legislation that will end on June 30, 1968, to deal with this immediate future period, which we do consider an emergency period insofar as it involves the necessity of providing jobs for Americans who urgently need useful and gainful employment, and the sense of dignity that can only come with a job and a chance to earn one's own living.

We offer this amendment as a means of shifting priorities from less essential items to an essential item of high priority and urgent need, in both our rural and urban communities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I do not question the purpose and intent of the pending amendment. The purposes are good. I have great respect for both of these dedicated Senators. However, speaking as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I think the Senate should have a word of caution.

I do not care who the President is or to what party he might belong, when we transfer to the President the power to determine priorities, after both our branches of the Congress and the Appropriations Committees and the committees of conference have thrashed out and determined the priorities on behalf of the Congress—in which body the Constitution vests this power and responsibility—we are liable to run into a good deal of trouble.

In principle I think it is a violation of constitutional intent, but I also would suggest to the Senate that it might find itself very much disappointed in the possible results.

We have just been going through a long committee of conference on the appropriation bill for Labor-HEW. The committee felt with respect to that appropriation bill that a certain amount of money should go to impacted school areas. The committee felt that a certain amount should go to a long-established and well-working program of national defense education funds in which I think almost every superintendent of schools and school principal in the country are interested.

The President, I am quite sure, is not in sympathy with those programs at this time.

The Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation has seen fit to add funds for air safety, for the policing of the air, for observation, for personnel, and for devices to insure the safety of those flying. The President does not approve of the addition of those funds.

It would be all right if the 2-percent leeway were restricted to the poverty program, to shifting programs within the poverty program itself. However, when we transfer to the President the power to

establish priorities all along the line on nondefense spending, we will suddenly wake up and find that our studied, final decision on very delicate and sensitive matters will have been nullified by our own action.

We will begin to hear from our school officials and those who are vitally interested in the development of airports and air safety. We will hear from the people.

The committees in both bodies of Congress have acted upon the matter. I feel that in spite of the good objectives of the pending amendment, to take this unprecedented step of surrendering to the Executive the power to establish priorities after we have gone clear through the legislative process—from the House committee to the House, from the Senate committee to the Senate, and from there to the conference committee, and finally to a decision—would be a very dangerous precedent to set.

I must oppose the amendment.

I am not authorized to speak for the members of the Appropriations Committee. However, I believe it will be found that almost every member of that committee feels this would set an extremely dangerous precedent.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, it is true that the action we seek to achieve is unprecedented. However, we live in unprecedented times.

It becomes very obvious as we study the basic problems of the cities of America that the key problem today is jobs. That is the view of everyone, whether they be sociologists, mayors, or people living in the ghettos.

It is also apparent that the Congress is reluctant either to spend the money and appropriate the funds, or to raise taxes to supply the funds needed for programs such as this.

Under such circumstances, we must make a choice. If we are unwilling to raise taxes and are unwilling to appropriate the money, then I believe we have a duty to start setting priorities. And if we ourselves are unwilling to set certain priorities, I see nothing wrong with allowing these priorities to be set by the President of the United States.

We should keep in mind that, whether we will it or not, the President of the United States does have the authority to withhold spending if he is dissatisfied with—or finds that he does not have the funds with which to carry out—programs that Congress authorized.

I recall that in 1961, after Congress had adjourned, the late President Kennedy—I having been a member of his Cabinet—called the Cabinet together and asked us to hold back on the spending of various appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, as the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I did withhold the spending of a substantial sum of money. If my memory serves me right, it involved a sum of \$100 million in funds that Congress had voted to appropriate. And no one raised the question of whether the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the President of the United States had the authority to withhold these funds.

We have a basic problem that we must decide. We should either vote the money and raise the taxes; or, if we are unwilling to take these steps, we should set priorities.

The needs are present and very great. This program is so important that we should at least give the President the authority to determine the priorities that are so vital to the future of our country.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, what the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has said is perfectly true. We do have precedents, I think, for impounding and withholding funds.

I do not know that the courts have ever passed on that privilege. However, in a sense it is exercising an item veto.

Let us concede that it is true. No one has questioned it. However, it is one thing to withhold money and not spend it. It is quite another thing to have the ability and the power to decide that some particular program that Congress has decided is highly important is not important or not as important as others, and to take money from that program and expend it in a way that Congress did not see fit to authorize.

I agree with the Senator. I commend him for what he has to say. Congress has not met its responsibility either in holding down expenditures or in being careful about priorities.

I have much sympathy with the position of the Senator from Connecticut and the junior Senator from Illinois. However, merely because we do not face up to our responsibilities in one respect, we are not going to improve things by transferring to the President of the United States the right to exercise this power. Congress might as well go home, if that is going to be its future policy.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I point out that there are 250 programs in the Federal Government today that deal with the problems of the city. That is the informal count we have received from the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Last year the mayor of Oakland appeared before our Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization and said that they had taken an inventory and found that there were some 140 Federal pro-

grams in which the city of Oakland alone was involved.

I have before me the catalog of the Federal assistance programs put out by the Office of Economic Opportunity. This newest catalog lists 459 channels through which Federal help and dollars can flow to cities, States, and individuals.

We are in a ridiculous situation. We pass program after program, and the executive branch of the Government and the Congress are equally at fault.

For we rarely stop to think about what America needs most. We keep voting piecemeal programs until they become astronomical in number and in amount. We think they will solve everything. Yet when we look at the problems, in depth, we finally realize that we can make our greatest impact on problems of poverty and disorder in our cities by providing job opportunities.

In 1966, the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress studied this problem. They pointed out that there were 5.3 million potential jobs in the public service field. In medical institutions and health services, there were 1.2 million; in educational institutions, 1.1 million; in national beautification, 1.3 million; in welfare and home care, 700,000; in public protection, 350,000; in urban renewal and sanitation, 650,000—some 5.3 million jobs, that were not leaf-raking and "make-work" tasks, but were both productive and in the public interest.

When you consider the rate of unemployment in our central cities, and when you study the riots across America, you see that teenaged youngsters, without jobs, often are in the forefront of the riots. We must realize that jobs are the important key to the self-respect that can help eliminate violence and help solve the crisis of the cities.

I believe that the program submitted by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is a worthwhile program. But the weakness of that program is that at a time of national stress and national shortage of funds, they are voting \$2.8 billion. We, as realistic men, know that Congress will not spend \$2.8 billion. But if jobs are as important as the committee says—and I agree that they are—then we have a duty to determine how we will set and reach this priority.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I have great regard for the comments made by the Senator from New Hampshire. I certainly respect the judgments of members of the Committee on Appropriations. I have a reverence for the operation procedures that have been developed over a period of many years in this body.

But I believe that sometimes emergency conditions require carefully calculated and carefully controlled innovations. The control placed upon this innovation would be that it would be subject to the discretion of the President. It would not involve additional funds. It would involve a transfer of funds. It would be strictly limited to 1 year. The authority would end on June 30, 1968. We have an election coming up,

and I have great faith in the electoral process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PERCY. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PERCY. The able Senator from New Hampshire has rightfully indicated that if the President chose to cut back, say, the air safety program or the school milk program, you would have enraged citizens, and you would have school superintendents making complaints to Congress. But the man who would be responsible for making that decision would be the President. Presumably, he would be running for reelection, and he would be held accountable for having made that decision. I believe we can have sufficient confidence in the President of the United States—one of the only two officers elected by all the people of this country—to use discretion, to consider this an emergency, to apply these funds only as would be prescribed in the measure, and to put them to work where those conditions exist today that have created in our cities an emergency condition.

We have talked a great deal about the long, hot summers, but they come only once a year. When I met yesterday with the leaders of nine of the Youth Corps centers in New York, each of them in turn said, "Now, this authority for the summer jobs is over, but where are the boys? Back on the streets." Perhaps the weather is cooler, but the condition is just as bad as it was before, and we need something that is year-round; because the frustration, the bitterness, and the discontent exist year-round. The hot summers are just the top of the iceberg. The remainder, which is not showing, is the fact that society has somehow not met the need of these people, who do want work but do not have the skill and training for one reason or another—perhaps because of their fault, perhaps the fault of society, or perhaps a combined fault.

This emergency situation calls for some innovation. This is a carefully controlled situation. If it did not work, we could easily cancel the authority. The authority would not be extended beyond June 30, 1968. Certainly, we would hold the President accountable for every decision he made. His commission, which already has been appointed, has indicated informally and in conversations that housing and jobs are the two most urgent problems they face. We are simply trying to find a way to meet the problems without adding to the deficit, without adding to the fires of inflation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] be permitted to speak for not to exceed 3 minutes, to submit a confer-

ence report, and that the time not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPOSITION OF JUDGMENT FUNDS DEPOSITED TO THE CREDIT OF THE CHEYENNE-ARAPAHO TRIBES OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask that the Presiding Officer lay before the Senate a message from the House on S. 1933, a bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1933) to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to distribute and expend the funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma that were appropriated by the Act of October 31, 1965 (79 Stat. 1133), in satisfaction of the settlement and compromise of claims of said tribes against the United States in the Indian Claims Commission in dockets numbered 329A and 329B, together with the interest accrued thereon, as herein provided.

Sec. 2. Five hundred thousand dollars of said funds shall be held in trust for the purpose of providing education and scholarships for members of said tribes pursuant to a trust agreement to be made and entered into by and between said tribes, as grantor, and a national banking association located in the State of Oklahoma, as trustee, which trust agreement shall be authorized and approved by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall distribute remaining funds per capita to all persons alive on the date of this Act whose names appear on the membership roll of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma or who, on the date of this Act, were eligible for membership, hereinafter referred to as "enrollees", as follows:

(a) a share payable to an enrollee not less than twenty-one years of age shall be paid directly in one payment to such enrollee, except as provided in subsections (b) and (c) of this section;

(b) a share payable to an enrollee dying after the date of this Act shall be distributed to his heirs or legatees upon the filing of proof of death and inheritance satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, whose findings and determinations upon such proof shall be final and conclusive: *Provided*, That if a share of such deceased enrollee, or a portion thereof, is payable to an heir or legatee under twenty-one years of age or under legal disability, the same shall be paid and held in trust pursuant to subsection (c) of this section;

(c) a share or proportional share payable to an enrollee or person under twenty-one years of age or to an enrollee or person under legal disability shall be paid and held in trust for such enrollee or person pursuant to a trust agreement to be made and entered into by and between the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma, as grantor, and a national banking association located in the State of Oklahoma, as trustee, which trust agreement shall be authorized and approved

by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 4. (a) All claims for per capita shares, whether by a living enrollee or by the heirs or legatees of a deceased enrollee, shall be filed with the area director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Anadarko, Oklahoma, not later than three years from the date of approval of this Act. Thereafter, all claims and the right to file same shall be forever barred and the unclaimed shares shall revert to the tribes.

(b) Tribal funds that revert to the tribes pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, including interest and income therefrom, may be advanced or expended for any purpose that is authorized by the tribal governing body.

Sec. 5. No part of any funds distributed or held in trust under the provisions of this Act shall be subject to Federal or State income taxes.

Sec. 6. Funds distributed and payments made under this Act shall not be held to be "other income and resources" as that term is used in sections 2(a)(10)(A), 402(a)(7), 1002(a)(8), and 1402(a)(8) of the Social Security Act as amended (42 U.S.C. 302(a)(10)(A), 602(a)(7), 1202(a)(8), and 1352(a)(8)).

Sec. 7. (a) All costs incident to making the payments authorized by this Act, including the costs of payment roll preparation and such sums as may be required to distribute said funds, shall be paid by appropriate withdrawals from the judgment fund and interest on the judgment fund, using the interest fund first.

(b) In the event that the sum of money reserved by the Secretary of the Interior to pay the costs of distributing said funds exceeds the amount actually necessary to accomplish this purpose, the money remaining shall revert to the tribes and may be advanced or expended for any purpose that is authorized and approved by the tribal governing body.

Sec. 8. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment, with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4 of the amendment adopted by the House, strike section 6 in its entirety.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the Members of the Senate will recall that as introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris] for himself and his colleague, Senator MONROE, S. 1933 had in it section 6, which provides that funds distributed under the act, amounting to some \$15 million, should not be held to be "other income" under the Social Security Act and hence subject to contribution under that law. However, after hearings on S. 1933 conducted by the Indian Affairs Subcommittee of the Interior Committee on August 9, the committee concurred in the recommendation of the Department of the Interior that the section be deleted.

The Department pointed out that it had consistently maintained that Indians are entitled to receive assistance under the Social Security Act on the same basis as non-Indians. Acceptance of this position has been achieved.

But acceptance of benefits under the act carries with it assumption of responsibilities. Payments to the fund from

which benefits are received is such a responsibility.

Thus, the deletion of section 6 from the bill was still another step forward in making Indians full-fledged American citizens, ready, willing, and able to accept responsibilities as well as benefits.

The committee was assured by responsible spokesmen for the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribe of Oklahoma that the tribe was willing to accept S. 1933 as we amended it.

However, the companion bill in the other body, H.R. 11847, was passed on September 18 with the provision exempting the per capita distribution funds from contribution under the social security law, and the text of the House-passed bill substituted for the text of S. 1933 as amended and approved by the Senate on August 21. The amendment I am proposing would, in effect, reinstate the Senate language.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on the basis of the position of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes in favor of the Senate position as the best way to secure the most rapid passage of this measure, I join in the motion just made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

I ask unanimous consent that certain correspondence and communications from those tribes be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

CLINTON, OKLA.,
August 22, 1967.

Hon. FRED R. HARRIS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRIS: Thank you for your work on S. 1933. Business committee now favors the complete omission of section six in order to expedite passage. We will want House to pass the Senate version and will notify EDMONSON by letter. Will you secure the flag used yesterday over the Senate for the tribes? This may be a presumptuous request but I know you understand their patriotism to our Nation with all American Indians. The flag will have great meaning to the members of the tribes and I will appreciate it if you can fulfill this request.

Very sincerely,

LAWRENCE H. HART.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
October 2, 1967.

Senator FRED R. HARRIS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully request passage of S. 1933 as amended. Cheyenne-Arapaho Business Committee by formal action favors deletion of section six. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE HART,
Cheyenne-Arapaho Chairman.

CONCHO, OKLA.

CHEYENNE AND ARAPAHO TRIBES,
August 23, 1967.

Re: S. 1933

Senator FRED R. HARRIS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRIS: The Business Committee of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of

Oklahoma met on August 21, 1967 to consider the Senate passage of S. 1933 as amended.

After a careful and thorough deliberation the Business Committee resolved to accept the Senate version. We feel that this will help to expedite passage by Congress. We also are impressed with the reasoning to the objection of Section Six. We concur with the objection and as an alternative we intend to cooperate fully with the Department of Public Welfare of the State of Oklahoma.

I want to thank you for your work on S. 1933. Your testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Affairs for and in behalf of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma was most impressive.

Very truly yours,

LAWRENCE H. HART,
Chairman, Cheyenne-Arapaho
Business Committee.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1564. An act to amend the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

S. 2162. An act to amend the act of January 17, 1936 (49 Stat. 1094), reserving certain public domain lands in Nevada and Oregon as a grazing reserve for Indians of Fort McDermitt, Nev.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 223) to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned long-lines communication facilities in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1308. An act to establish the Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site in the State of Massachusetts, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4772. An act to authorize the Secretaries concerned to direct the initiation of allotments of the pay and allowances of certain members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of making deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code;

H.R. 4903. An act to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands;

H.R. 5943. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps;

H.R. 8632. An act to amend section 40c(1) and 52a of the Bankruptcy Act so as to reallocate part of the filing fee from the clerk's earnings to the referees' salary and expense fund;

H.R. 9796. An act to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence and new loans, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11767. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.; and

H.R. 12910. An act to establish a Judge

Advocate General's Corps in the Navy, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 1308. An act to establish the Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site in the State of Massachusetts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4772. An act to authorize the Secretaries concerned to direct the initiation of allotments of the pay and allowances of certain members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of making deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code;

H.R. 4903. An act to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands;

H.R. 5943. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps;

H.R. 9796. An act to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence and new loans, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11767. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.; and

H.R. 12910. An act to establish a Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 8632. An act to amend section 40c(1) and 52a of the Bankruptcy Act so as to reallocate part of the filing fee from the clerk's earnings to the referees' salary and expense fund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] be recognized for not to exceed 3 minutes, for the submission of a conference report, and that the time not be charged to either side.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his courtesy.

ACQUISITION OF CAREER STATUS BY TEMPORARY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1320) to provide for the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Sept. 28, 1967, p. 27175, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I believe we have worked out a good bill. Both the House and Senate versions of the bill were designed to provide for the conversion of certain long-term temporary employees in the classified and postal service to career status. Both committees held hearings on this legislation and heard testimony from the Civil Service Commission, the Post Office Department, and interested Federal employees and Federal employee organizations.

We have ironed out certain basic policy differences between the House and

Senate versions. After a full and free conference, and after a cooperative session with our counterparts from the House of Representatives, we are able to recommend a final version which will eliminate a serious inequity in present law and generally improve the efficiency of the civil service.

The conference report provides for the conversion of temporary indefinite or TAPER employees to career status if they have 3 years' continuous service, pass a suitable noncompetitive civil service examination, are otherwise eligible and qualified for the position, and receive a recommendation from their agency for conversion to a career appointment. In the case of postal employees, the legal ratio of five regular employees for each

one substitute will be maintained, and conversions will take place only when suitable vacancies occur.

The Whitten amendment, imposing a limitation on the total number of permanent employees in the Government, which was enacted in 1951 and which has been revised from time to time since then, is repealed.

At this point I would like to have inserted in the RECORD an analysis of the differences between the House and Senate bills and a statement of the agreement on each point reached by the conference.

There being no objection, the analysis and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1320—TAPER APPOINTMENTS CONFERENCE TYPE OF APPOINTMENTS

House version

House excludes any term appointment and supergrades

CONVERSION REQUIREMENTS

1. Three years' service
2. Suitable noncompetitive, unassembled examination
3. Recommendation by superior and certification that work is "satisfactory."
4. General eligibility and current qualification.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Postal employees are included in amendments to title 5.

CONVERSION REQUIREMENTS FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

1. Three years' service
2. 700 hours satisfactory work each year.
3. Suitable noncompetitive unassembled exam.
4. Recommendation by superior and certification that work is "satisfactory."

RATIO OF REGULARS TO SUBSTITUTES

House waives ratio requirement but postmaster must certify that other substitutes having career appointments will not lose any regular work.

WHITTEN AMENDMENT

House has no limiting language.

EFFECTIVE DATES

House has 90-day grace period.

Conference agreement

Senate provision adopted

Conferees have agreed to:

- (1) Three years' service;
- (2) Noncompetitive examination;
- (3) Recommendation by superior and certification of "satisfactory" service;
- (4) General eligibility and qualification.

Postal employees included in title 39; other employees included in title 5.

Conferees have agreed to:

- (1) Three years' service;
- (2) 700 hours' satisfactory work each year;
- (3) Noncompetitive examination;
- (4) Recommendation by superior and certification of "satisfactory" service.

Senate provision adopted.

Senate provision adopted.

House provision adopted.

Senate version

Senate excludes any term appointment, overseas limited appointments and supergrades

1. Four years' service
2. Suitable non-competitive examinations
3. Recommendation by superior and certification that work is "equivalent" to employees appointed competitively.
4. General eligibility and qualification

Has a different section of the bill unrelated to classified service, to amend postal statutes (title 39) rather than government employees statutes generally (title 5)

1. Four years' service
2. 700 hours satisfactory work each year.
3. Suitable noncompetitive exam.
4. Recommendation by superior and certification that work is equivalent to employees appointed competitively.

Senate requires conversions be "stockpiled" awaiting vacancies. Regular 5 to 1 ratio will continue in full effect.

Senate limits permanent appointments to number necessary "required for the efficiency of the Federal Civil Service."

Senate provides 120-day grace period for the first group of employees not recommended for conversion before they are automatically separated.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. Pres-

ident, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, so frequently do I find myself in sympathy with the views expressed by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] and the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Percy] that it is with great reluctance I find it necessary to oppose the amendment they have offered, although I am highly sympathetic to the principles which inspired it. As a matter of fact, I had offered the same amendment in committee and it was rejected.

Mr. President, since that time I have changed my mind on this matter because

I think, as the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire has so eloquently expressed it, this amendment would abrogate the appropriation process which has been in the Congress for these many years.

If we leave this matter up to the administration to determine where funds are going to be removed from other programs and transfer them to the poverty program, I am sure we are going to find that many programs which we have all supported in our own districts and elsewhere will be nullified. I think it is the responsibility of Congress to determine where money is going to be appropriated, how, and for what programs. We would violate that concept under the proposed amendment.

In addition, I am opposed to the measure because, on behalf of myself and the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania, I shall offer an amendment later on which I hope a majority of the Senate will consider constructive, and a compromise which a majority on both sides can accept.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield so that I may ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, there is nothing more I can add to what has been said except to say that at the Republican policy luncheon this noon, many members of the Committee on Appropriations expressed deep concern over the procedure suggested by my two distinguished colleagues. For that reason, and for other reasons, I hope very much that the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask that the time not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, with some regret, because the proposal is rather alluring, I am opposed to the Ribicoff-Percy amendment.

The key clause is section 209, which establishes in the Treasury an emergency employment fund. The section further provides:

To provide capital for such fund, the President is authorized to allocate to such fund not to exceed 2 per centum of any unobligated funds, appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, which are determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to be available to carry out Federal programs which are not directly and primarily related to the national defense.

This proposal, to me, is quite unrealistic. In the first place, it circumvents the already swollen defense appropriations. If any money is to be cut to provide funds for the Emergency Employment Act, that is where they should come from.

I think the debates on the military authorization bills and the Military Appropriation Act have shown quite conclusively, at least to my satisfaction, that the military-industrial-scientific complex, which has pretty nearly taken over this country, has gotten appropriations for the vast expansion of military activities which are definitely not in our national interest.

We have been having a debate in connection with Vietnam on the floor of the Senate for the last several days. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who probably has been as well informed as any other Senator in this body about the cost of the Vietnam war, responded to a question by me just a few weeks ago that the actual cost of the war in Vietnam is running about \$30 billion a year.

Mr. President, that, in itself, is more than 10 times the amount which this Emergency Employment Act asks to be authorized. The remainder of the military budget—Vietnam is less than one-half of it—is still susceptible to being cut by 2 percent, and I think probably more. To my way of thinking, the exclusion of the national defense appropriation from the areas where cuts should be made under the Ribicoff-Percy amendment is unwise and really unfair. I reiterate that this swollen military budget is the one place where I think cuts could easily be made. For that reason alone, I would oppose this amendment.

However, a second reason for opposing the proposal is perhaps best expressed by asking a question: How is the President going to determine what appropriation he is going to cut by 2 percent? He cannot cut in on the national debt which is one of the largest of the items in our budget. Is he going to cut the expenditures for the space program; or will some say, and not without reason, that the space program is directly and primarily related to the national defense? I do not think it is, but imagine the storm which would arise on the floor of the Senate if we abandoned the effort to put a man on the moon in order to pay for the poverty program. Mr. President, I think we should, but to me this is not pragmatically or politically feasible.

Are we going to cut back on the Atomic Energy Commission and its efforts in support of the peaceful development of atomic energy? Imagine what that lobby would say if the President was going to cut 2 percent from that. Are we going to take from health programs and social security programs, or primary, secondary, and higher education programs?

Are we going to take it out of public works? Are we going to take it out of air pollution control? Are we going to take it out of water pollution control?

We would not dare take it out of the highway program, would we? That is a sacred cow. Think of the lobbyists for the highway program who would be storming the ramparts of the Senate if 2 percent were to be taken out of that.

I have great sympathy for the President of the United States in the difficult situation in which he finds himself, but I would not want to make those difficulties almost insuperable by throwing the Ribicoff amendment at him and saying, "Look, Congress passes the buck to you. You decide where these programs shall be cut. Do not ask us to do our congressional duty by telling you where we want the appropriations cut to pay for the poverty program."

Mr. President, I would hope very much that the OEO Act would survive the debate which has been instituted on the

floor of the Senate, but I cannot conscientiously vote for the Ribicoff-Percy amendment. To my way of thinking, it is unfair to the President. It is unrealistic in terms of the way to legislate, to create appropriations for badly needed programs. It is quite wrong in excluding the military budget from the area in which the cut is to be made.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twelve minutes remain to the Senator from Connecticut and 14 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the argument of my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania, particularly to his dire predictions as to what would happen if we cut back on the multitude of programs which he reeled off.

I commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for having the foresight to add title II to the poverty bill—a giant step forward in trying to solve the problems of the American cities.

The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania would not have taken this great step that will cost \$2.8 billion if he did not think it was important.

But if we really believe that jobs are the No. 1 priority in America today in the ghettos and cities of America, then we should be willing to say that if we do not have sufficient funds, then we will spend our money on the matters and the programs that are most important.

The distinguished Senator was absent from the Chamber when I pointed out that the Department of Housing and Urban Renewal estimated there are some 250 urban programs. The latest OEO catalog indicates there are 459 programs through which Federal funds flow to various cities, organizations, and individuals.

Basically, if the various committees of Congress have not taken the time to list the priority items among 459 programs, then I believe that we have abdicated our responsibility.

Mr. President, I should like to read for a few moments from an article in the publication "Urban America: Goals and Problems," of the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on Urban Affairs. The article was written by Roger Starr, who is the executive director of the Citizens Housing and Planning Council of New York. He writes:

One cannot understand the riots without studying the psychological structure of the rioters and their sympathizers, or investigating their family constellations, education, and personal history. Such an investigation might reveal that the riots themselves are not so much a form of protest as a form of gratification; that they express the extent of the disorganization of some low-income Negro families as well as the economic and social deprivation of the Negro community as a whole. Such an investigation might reveal that this family disorganization is partly

the cause of the conditions complained of, and partly an effect of those conditions. From this point of view, the riots become, for those engaged in them, a substitute for the gratifications of work, and the socially acceptable masculine satisfactions of family leadership.

The article also points to the basic need for jobs in establishing the self-respect of the individuals who are rioting, the gratification of having a job, the need of the people for self-respect, so that they will feel they have some meaning in our society.

I, for one, cannot understand the leadership of this august committee, which was willing to face the problem and the need for jobs, and willing to say that they would authorize the expenditure of \$2.8 billion because they thought it was so important, even though we are running a deficit of \$29 billion at the present time; and their current position of being concerned that if an element of priority was introduced, some less important items might be deferred for a year. All these items are important. But the time has come for us not to put all our faith in a programmatic approach, which has failed, but in a systematic approach based on priorities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. With all the programs we have voted on, we still have not achieved the objective we sought. The reason is that we have not gone to the root of the basic problem that plagues the ghettos and cities of America.

The No. 1 problem that cries out for priority action is for jobs. The No. 2 priority is housing.

I do not believe that we are studying the problem enough, that we are willing to come up with a solution, when we fear to ask the President to temporarily put aside a worthy project if it does not have the priority of jobs and housing—and in this case we are talking about jobs.

I would hope that since the Congress of the United States is unwilling to vote the funds or to vote the taxes for the No. 1 priority of the cities in America, that at least we would have the good judgment to authorize the President to defer the expenditure of programs that are of less importance in order to vote money for jobs, jobs which the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania and his committee thought were so important that they were willing to authorize \$2.8 billion of new money.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield at that point for a question?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have not read the entire amendment, but when we talk about setting aside 2 percent, is that the figure—

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is on the domestic budget.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. Is that 2 percent in any given project, or is it 2 percent of the total?

Mr. RIBICOFF. It is 2 percent of the total. The President would be able to make the choice as to whether he would take the 2 percent. He could take more than 2 percent from one project, or nothing from another.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In other words, there would be flexibility there.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would not be what is called 2 percent across the board?

Mr. RIBICOFF. No. It would not be.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The total sum allocated would be 2 percent, or a total of \$1.1 billion that would be taken from the overall domestic budget of approximately \$55 billion; is that not correct?

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will heed the cogent arguments presented by the Senators from Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, and Vermont, and reject the motion, cosponsored by the Senators from Connecticut and Illinois, which would substitute instructions for the instructions in the motion which has been offered by the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senators yield back their time?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Illinois. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INOUE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote. The rollcall was resumed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr.

COOPER] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 73, as follows:

[No. 273 Leg.]

YEAS—14

| | | |
|----------|-----------|----------|
| Brewster | Jackson | Proxmire |
| Case | Long, La. | Ribicoff |
| Dodd | Magnuson | Smathers |
| Harris | Morton | Tydings |
| Hartke | Percy | |

NAYS—73

| | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| Aiken | Hansen | Mondale |
| Allott | Hart | Monroney |
| Anderson | Hatfield | Mundt |
| Bartlett | Hayden | Murphy |
| Bennett | Hickenlooper | Muskie |
| Bible | Hill | Nelson |
| Boggs | Holland | Pearson |
| Brooke | Hollings | Pell |
| Burdick | Hruska | Proty |
| Byrd, Va. | Javits | Randolph |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Jordan, N.C. | Scott |
| Cannon | Jordan, Idaho | Smith |
| Carlson | Kennedy, Mass. | Sparkman |
| Church | Kennedy, N.Y. | Spong |
| Clark | Kuchel | Stennis |
| Cotton | Lausche | Symington |
| Curtis | Long, Mo. | Talmadge |
| Dirksen | Mansfield | Thurmond |
| Dominick | McCarthy | Williams, N.J. |
| Eastland | McClellan | Williams, Del. |
| Fannin | McGee | Yarborough |
| Fong | McGovern | Young, N. Dak. |
| Fulbright | McIntyre | Young, Ohio |
| Griffin | Metcalfe | |
| Gruening | Miller | |

NOT VOTING—13

| | | |
|----------|---------|---------|
| Baker | Gore | Pastore |
| Bayh | Inouye | Russell |
| Cooper | Montoya | Tower |
| Ellender | Morse | |
| Ervin | Moss | |

So the Ribicoff-Percy amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 371

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], I call up amendment No. 371, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 371) of Mr. PROUTY is as follows:

In lieu of the instruction to strike out title II, I move to strike title II and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE II—EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Emergency Employment Act of 1967'.

"PART A—EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

"FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 202. (a) The Congress finds that certain communities and areas in the Nation

are presently burdened by severe unemployment and underemployment. Such areas contain large concentrations or proportions of persons who are unable to obtain jobs in regular competitive employment because of lack of education, occupational skill, or work experience and because of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement. This situation is aggravated by migration of unskilled rural residents to urban areas. Many of the affected areas are doubly handicapped by the lack of sufficient jobs for all the potential labor force. This condition is destructive of human dignity and results in a loss of national productivity. In many localities the problem has reached crisis proportion by contributing to social unrest and civil disorder.

"(b) At the same time there is a huge backlog of need for additional public services and public facilities in such fields as those which (1) contribute to the development of human potential, (2) better the conditions under which people live, learn, and work, and (3) aid in the development and conservation of natural resources.

"(c) Therefore, it is the purpose of this part to provide meaningful employment opportunities in public service and other activities which will relieve severe unemployment in urban and rural areas and contribute to the national interest by fulfilling unmet needs.

"ELIGIBLE AREAS

"SEC. 203. The Secretary of Labor (hereafter referred to as the 'Secretary') shall designate urban and rural areas to be eligible for assistance under this part. Such areas shall contain a high concentration or proportion of low-income families and individuals and shall have severe problems of unemployment and underemployment or, with respect to rural areas, problems of out-migration. They may be defined without regard to political boundaries.

"FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance to public agencies and private organizations for part or all of the costs of programs which create meaningful public service and other employment opportunities. He shall adopt procedures to assure (1) that there is maximum emphasis on local initiative and responsibility with full participation of and maximum cooperation among local public officials, residents of eligible areas, and representatives of private organizations in the establishment of programs under this part, including, without limitation, the determination of areas and participants eligible for assistance and the selection of projects under subsection (b) of this section, and (2) that such assistance is fully coordinated with programs operated under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, and other relevant Federal Acts.

"(b) Jobs created or made available under this part may include services and supporting facilities in such fields as health, public safety, education, recreation, streets, parks and municipal maintenance, housing and neighborhood improvement, conservation and rural development, beautification, and other fields of human betterment and public improvement. Such jobs shall include (1) those which can be made available immediately to persons who are otherwise unable to obtain employment, (2) those which provide placement resources for persons completing training under titles I and V of the Economic Opportunity Act and other relevant manpower training programs, and (3) those which use the skills of unemployed persons in areas with a chronic labor surplus. Priority shall be given to projects which are labor intensive in character.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance to assure that (1) persons employed in jobs created by this part are provided opportunity for further education, training, and necessary supportive services, including those provided by other relevant Acts, so that they may be prepared to obtain regular competitive employment in the future; and (2) that maximum effort is made to encourage private employers to adopt innovative approaches which create additional jobs and new types of careers for low-income and disadvantaged persons.

"LOANS

"SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make loans to public and private agencies for the purchase of supplies and equipment which support and supplement projects carried out by participants under section 204.

"(b) Loans authorized under this section may be made without interest and under such other terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe.

"ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS

"SEC. 206. (a) Participants in programs under this part must be unemployed or low-income persons who reside in eligible areas and who meet other criteria prescribed by the Secretary and priority shall be given to persons who are heads of families. Low income shall be defined in terms of section 125 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

"(b) For the purposes of this part, the term 'heads of families' includes any person who contributes more than one-half of the support of one or more other persons.

"SPECIAL CONDITIONS

"SEC. 207. (a) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this part unless he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

"(1) no participant will be employed on projects involving political parties, or the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

"(2) the program will not result in displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services, or result in the substitution of Federal for other funds in connection with work that would otherwise be performed;

"(3) wages paid a participant shall not be lower than, whichever is the highest of (A) the minimum wage which would be applicable to the employment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 if section 6 of such Act applied to the participant and he was not exempt under section 13 thereof, (B) the State or local minimum wage for the most nearly comparable covered employment, or (C) the prevailing rate of wages in the area for similar work;

"(4) the program will, to the extent appropriate, contribute to the occupational development or upward mobility of individual participants.

"(b) For programs related to physical improvements, preference shall be given to those improvements which will be substantially used by low-income persons and families in urban neighborhoods or rural areas having concentrations or proportions of low-income persons and families.

"(c) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to assure that programs under this part have adequate internal administrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel standards, evaluation procedures, and other policies as may be necessary to promote the effective use of funds.

"(d) Programs approved under this part shall, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the elimination of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement, including civil service requirements which restrict employment opportunities for the disadvantaged.

"REPORTS

"SEC. 208. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report on the progress made in implementing this part and suggestions for improvements on or before May 15, 1968, November 15, 1968, and on or before May 15 and November 15 of each year thereafter.

"PART B—HUMAN INVESTMENT JOB TRAINING

"SEC. 210. This part may be cited as the Human Investment Act of 1967.

"PURPOSE

"SEC. 211. The purpose of this part is to provide incentives to private employers other than nonprofit organizations to invest in the improvement of the Nation's human resources by hiring, training, and employing persons eligible to participate in programs as provided in section 206 of this title.

"DEFINITION

"SEC. 212. For purposes of this part, the term 'employer' means any private person, corporation, firm, or business concern which employs more than ten individuals in a trade or business.

"FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 213. In order to carry out the provisions of this part, the Secretary of Labor is authorized:

"(a) To provide financial assistance to employers for training and employment costs incurred pursuant to a plan approved by the Secretary of Labor under section 214, including, but not limited to—

"(1) unusual training and other unusual services for a limited period when an employee might not be fully productive, including, on-the-job counseling, day care and other supportive services;

"(2) all or part of employer costs of sending recruiters into areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income persons;

"(3) payments to permit employers to provide employees resident in such areas with transportation to and from work or to reimburse such employees for such transportation; and

"(4) unusual overhead costs incurred as a result of an employee's lack of education, training, or experience, such as costs of spoilage of work or of added managerial effort.

"(b) To prescribe regulations to—

"(1) establish criteria to achieve an equitable distribution among the States of payments made from funds reserved under this Act; but not more than 12.5 per centum of the funds so reserved for any fiscal year shall be used within any one State;

"(2) provide such application, reporting, and accounting procedures as he deems necessary;

"(3) provide for an evaluation of the program authorized by this subsection in achieving the objectives of this part;

"(4) safeguard against abuses of any incentives provided under this part, including, but not limited to, safeguards against the use of such incentives in order to transfer any enterprise from one area to another and safeguards designed to prevent such incentives from being used as a subsidy for normal operations; and

"(5) assure compliance with the requirements of section 207(a) of this title.

"TRAINING PLAN

"SEC. 214. No financial assistance shall be provided under this part except upon approval by the Secretary of a plan submitted by an employer which shall be revised from time to time as requested by the Secretary, the provisions of which shall include:

"(a) The title and description of the job objectives for which individuals are to be trained;

"(b) The length of the training period;

"(c) A schedule listing various operations for major kinds of work or tasks to be learned and showing, for each, job opera-

tions or work, tasks to be performed, and the approximate length of time to be spent on each operation or task;

"(d) The wage or salary to be paid at the beginning of the course or training, at each successive step in the course and at the completion of training;

"(e) The entrance wage or salary paid to employees already trained in the kind of work for which the individuals are to be trained;

"(f) The number of hours of supplemental instruction required; and

"(g) Information respecting the cost of usual training and other usual services provided employees other than those described in section 206 of this title, in order to make them fully productive.

"Sec. 215. For purposes of applying chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, any grant received by an employer under this part—

"(a) shall not be included in the gross income of such employer, and

"(b) shall not be treated as reimbursement for expenses incurred by such employer in his trade or business.

"PART C—AUTHORIZATIONS, DURATION OF PROGRAM

"Sec. 221. The Secretary shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the succeeding fiscal year.

"Sec. 222. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, except the provisions of section 205, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$875,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

"(b) Of the funds authorized under subsection (a) of this section, not less than 10 per centum nor more than 20 per centum shall be used by the Secretary for the purpose of carrying out training programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 for persons eligible under section 206 of this title.

"(c) Of the funds appropriated under subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall reserve not less than 12.5 per centum nor more than 37.5 per centum for the purpose of carrying out part B of this title.

"(d) For the purpose of making loans under section 205, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

"(e) Appropriations authorized by this section shall remain available until expended."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], as well as with the proponent of the pending amendment, the manager of the bill, and others, I send to the desk a unanimous-consent request and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent request will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on Wednesday, October 4, after the approval of the Journal there be a quorum call to ascertain the presence of a quorum, immediately after which further debate on the motion by the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Prouty) (amendment No. 371) to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Byrd) to recommit with instructions S. 2388, a bill to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an

Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes, be limited to 20 minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Prouty) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Byrd).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, just to make it clear, Senators have unlimited time today and tonight, as long as they wish to remain in session, to debate this amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; the limitation does not begin until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the majority leader at what time he intends to have the Senate convene tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Ten o'clock. We already have an order.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether amendments to the Prouty amendment would be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not if the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

VIETNAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on yesterday we had very considerable discussion of the situation in Vietnam, and I think it ranged into the question of the conduct of that struggle.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I suggest that the Chamber be cleared and that there be order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chamber will be cleared, and we will have order. All attachés whose presence is not needed in the Chamber will remove themselves from the Chamber.

The Sergeant at Arms is directed to see that these instructions to clear the Chamber are carried out.

The Senator from Illinois may proceed. Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, from time to time inquiry has been made of me about what seems like dissident views that have been expressed on this question of Vietnam, and particularly as it relates to the minority side of the aisle.

I have stated over and over again that the Republican Party umbrella is ample for all purposes and for all shades of opinion. I have only two concerns. The first is, of course, that we do not try to invade the constitutional prerogative of the President of the United States.

The first article of the Constitution does give to the Congress the power of the purse. And, in exercise of that power, we can discipline virtually everything in Government.

The Congress also is the exclusive law-making body in our form of government, and we can abolish every bureau. We can abolish nearly every agency. We cannot abolish the Presidency or the Supreme

Court because they are constitutional offices. However, with those exceptions, we can go pretty far in exercising our exclusive function as the one and only lawmaking body. The fact that a whole body of administrative law has developed in this country was only possible under a delegation of power by Congress.

So, we have the power of the purse, and when the Constitution made the President the Commander in Chief, it tendered to him the sword of the country. And that includes not only the conduct of our foreign relations, but also the conduct of any struggle or hostility in which we might be engaged.

The only other concern I have is about my own conduct in this matter. I want to be sure it is in conformity with my conscience and my conviction. Beyond that, it does not make any difference, because my responsibility is to explore for the facts, to ascertain as much as I can on a given subject, and then to exercise an independent judgment.

Mr. President, I hope I have not failed to do that, for Edmond Burke once remarked in Parliament that he felt he would betray his constituency if he did not do that. I grant the same privilege, the same prerogative, and the same latitude of every Member of the Senate.

What is more, I have no hostility toward criticism. I think it was in World War I that Woodrow Wilson said that in time of war we need more criticism, not less. But always it has to be within the framework of our constitutional power, and we must not arrogate to ourselves the conduct of an external struggle.

I think we have had some lessons in that field. Mr. President, the very Capitol, where we sit in the Senate wing, was destroyed in the War of 1812 because there was too much civil interference with the conduct of that war.

Lincoln did not brook any interference from a committee that was set up on the conduct of the war. I think it was General Grant who said that the greatest aid for him was from none other than Jefferson Davis, the President of the Confederacy, because he was interfering with Robert E. Lee and his tactics and his strategy.

Who shall say what the outcome of that war would have been if that great general from the South had been left alone? Nobody knows, but that interference was helpful, and Grant recognized it and paid testimony to it.

So, I grant that right, but I hope always it will be within due bounds. However, criticism, I always recognize.

On Sunday I had an experience and at first, I did not know how it came about. The operator of a very splendid motel in Galesburg, Ill., called me on the telephone. I scarcely know him. He said that he and the city—having a population of about 40,000—were going to be hosts to about 130 or 140 Vietnam veterans, all wounded, who were in the hospital at Great Lakes, Ill.

The whole community was energized to turn out for these youngsters. They lodged them. They fed them. They entertained them. They brought them from Great Lakes to Galesburg, a distance of 150 miles, and they took them back.

I was asked to get on the telephone at 5 o'clock on Sunday and to make them a telephone speech, which I did.

When the speech was over, a sergeant by the name of Wright was designated to respond to the speech, and he did.

He said:

Senator, we want to thank you. You are in our corner, and you have stood up for us, and you stood up for the cause. And we, the wounded from Vietnam, want you to know it from us. And we say it as sincerely, as simply, as emphatically as we know how. We simply thank you.

What I did first on Sunday was to salute them as a measure of deference, because a salute is given to a superior, and I recognize the superiority of their sacrifice. They come back without legs and without arms. And if anybody wants to see what Vietnam has done, he needs only to go out to Walter Reed, which is an evacuation hospital, to see the results.

When flowers came into my room at the hospital from time to time, I got a cart and went down to the Vietnam wards with those bouquets. They were better for them than for me. However, I have seen what has happened, and I yield to nobody in my hope, in my desire, and in my prayers that somehow this insane and grim and grisly business can honorably come to an end.

I think you have to say that for the President of the United States. I cannot in my position, and I cannot under any circumstances, denigrate him or demean him in the eyes of the world in connection with this controversy by anything that I might say. And so, granting all this latitude to anybody in the legislative branch of the Government, I feel that the time has come to say a little more than I have said on the subject of Vietnam.

I recognize my kinship with those who were out in Galesburg, Ill., by virtue of a common uniform which I wore 50 years ago as a private first class, as a sergeant, and as a second lieutenant in France on the western front. That is a kinship that you cannot forget.

And I want to be sure that almost a half million American boys who are out there in the cause of our country will not be the forgotten men under any circumstances, because they are too precious as Americans who have responded and are willing to do their duty even if the last and supreme sacrifice is required for their services.

I will never forget as I think of the thousands who have now died, in addition to the thousands who have been wounded, the lines of Colonel McCrae, that Canadian doctor who had a field dressing station on the banks of the Ypres River in France, and saw the bodies roll down into the door of his dressing room tent out there on the front, and who finally committed his soul to paper and in that tender and gentle poem said:

We are the Dead. Short days ago
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
Loved and were loved, and now we lie
In Flanders fields.

Well, some boys are lying out there. I do not know what I would say to the shades of those who made that sacrifice.

I want to be sure, if I can, that it is not a vanity and that I fully recognize my responsibility in an anxious hour like this.

It was said the other day:

First. That our programs and our policies were suspect by friend and foe alike. Where, I would like to know? Who besides Bonnie Charles de Gaulle has been so bold as to affront us in this field? Thirty countries are helping us now. Have you heard it from Australia? Have you heard it from New Zealand? Have you heard it from Korea? Indeed, not. The nations have been there in our corner. They did not always send troops, but there were other kinds of assistance that they sent.

So, is that a good sentiment to utter, that we are suspect by friend and foe alike? I do not know where it is, and I want to see the proof. And I do not like to see it go on the dispatch wires into every corner of the earth, to make a headline.

I remember once doing some work on immigration, trying to help India; and when I got to Bombay and Calcutta, the headlines were that high—"India's Friend Is Here."

Nothing is provincial here, or parochial; nothing is limited. What we say here goes on the wire. And if you want a lesson, send somewhere—I could tell you where—to get the international short-wave monitor, and see what is said on the Senate floor, which goes out of the shortwave stations from Peking and from Hanoi and elsewhere.

How good is it for the morale of the troops? You ought to be out there on the front on a lonely night, when the bombs are dropping or the mortar shells are coming over, and see whether it makes a difference. Oh, yes, they begin to wonder whether they are the forgotten men, and are forgotten back home. It is a ghastly feeling, I can tell you; and sometimes I had it on the western front a long, long time ago. That is one thing about which I want to be extremely careful.

It has been said that the President was brainwashed by a military-industrial complex. I would hate to have heard that said about General Eisenhower, the grand captain of the second great crusade mission in world affairs. I do not believe anybody ever said it about him, great tactician that he was, great strategist that he was. They combed the Army to find him. And General Marshall was deeply attached to him. And so he became the grand captain.

Well, I can imagine how he feels about a statement like that. It does not sound good and it does not look good, because he was a Republican President who served us with honor and distinction. And it would not sound good about any President.

Have you heard the British demean their King and Queen? If you have, show me the day and the time. Why, we were so circumspect about it that when the King and Queen were our guests, we set up a scaffolding in that rotunda so that the cameras would not catch the surrender of Burgoyne at Saratoga and the surrender of Lord Cornwallis. That is how circumspect we were. And I was

there, roving around in the place, to find out what it was all about.

No, you do not demean the ruler. The President is not our ruler, but you do not demean him in the eyes of people abroad; for when you do, you demean the prestige of this Republic. And I do not mean to do it, as the one remaining great, free republic on the face of the earth.

Yesterday, this whole question about security came up. Where was our security? I heard the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee ask these questions. I am no tactician, goodness knows. I have been to the command staff school as a lieutenant, but I am no tactician, I am no strategist. But I do know this, Mr. President, from those with whom I have associated in government: that our outer defense perimeter started in Korea and went to South Vietnam. Now, you see, Saigon, in South Vietnam, is at the lower end. That is our left flank. Suppose the left flank of your line is turned and you lose Vietnam? Then what?

The distinguished Senator from Hawaii can certainly tell us about how close it is from the Philippines to Malaysia and to Indonesia. And you cite to me a holding station where you can hold if we lose Vietnam. There is no place short of Singapore. Anybody who has some perspective knowledge of tactics can tell you that. And when you are in Singapore, you are at one of the clogged water courses that I am confident, as surely as I am standing here, the Soviets are going to try to control. Control Panama, control Singapore, the two ends of the Gulf of Aden and Suez, and you have just about command of the world. That is all you need.

So you have to see this in perspective. There is no holding line between Saigon and Singapore. So when they speak about the fall of Southeast Asia, they are not kidding. And I am not disposed to quarrel with men who have gone through our military schools, who have worked with worldwide maps, and who are expected to plot this thing in the large. That is what you need for the security of the country.

There may be Members in this body this afternoon who may remember, as I remember, when during the war we went down to the Munitions Building for briefings by George Marshall, the Chief of Staff.

I almost fell out of my seat one morning. These were members of the Appropriations Committee. I almost fell out of my seat when suddenly, out of a clear sky, he said:

Gentlemen, I may have bad news for you.

We waited with bated breath. He said:

Our best intelligence tells us that the Japanese are going to invade Alaska, and for the moment we can't stop them. We can't redeploy our troops from the Pacific. We think the strategy we follow is correct; and if they invade Alaska, we'll have to let them do it.

What do you think the wave would have been in this country if the Japanese Army had suddenly invaded Alaska? I ask you.

Why, it would have been a wave of such intensity that I expect people would want to come and cut the throats of

leaders down here for letting our domain be invaded. But General Marshall was a soldier and a great one. He knew what he had to do, no matter how much he might be scolded, and he kept the ship's nose in the wind. Everybody knows how we came out. He was right and I do not try to argue with them about it.

That is our outside security line. Suppose it fails. I think the Senator from Missouri could tell us the answer. It will run from Alaska to Hawaii, and you tell me how far you are from San Francisco and Los Angeles, as to whether or not our security is involved out there in Asia. If I did not think it was, I guess I would take another good long look at this whole business before we get through.

It has been said we have not emphasized the political needs and aspects of this controversy in the face of the fact that maybe we cannot get a military solution. Have we defaulted in that field? I thought they had an election out there to pick a constituent assembly. I thought they had an election out there. Senator MURPHY and Senator HICKENLOOPER went there as observers from this side. They came back and said that in their judgment it was a fair and honest election. They brought back ballots with them and indicated exactly how the people went to the polls. Is it not strange that in this second election in September a half million more people voted than had voted in the earlier election? Does that mean anything? It means we have done something to dispel fears in Vietnam and in shoving back the Vietcong so that life can pursue its normal course. Has that been neglecting the political fabric? Those figures simply do not prove it.

I reemphasize these two facts largely because the point is made that our security is not involved. This is a pretty small consideration when one thinks of these high-speed bombers. The designers are not at all satisfied with the speeds we get today, and I presume that would be particularly true with respect to military aircraft. They have just tied this great ball into short reaches, and you can go from here to there in very short order. When you do so on a pair of wings, you can have in the fuselage the lethal and deadly weapons that will impair our security. Let no one say our security is not involved, and with it, of course, the peace of the world is involved.

Who can forget how fast these things move. Here was a student. I suppose almost everybody has forgotten his name. His name was Princip and he was standing in a doorway in the little town of Sarajevo. When the Austrian Archduke and his Duchess, who were the heirs to the throne, came by, out comes the pistol and he shoots and both die before they get to the hospital. The legends are set in motion. The boots on the cobblestones begin to sound all over Europe, and before we knew it we were caught up in a frightful conflagration.

What about this area in Southeast Asia? Are we there to stop aggression? I think we are. Are we there in the interest of peace so that the thing will not spread? I think we are. Are we there in the interest of self-determination, a phrase Woodrow Wilson used so often?

I think we are. Can we not do that without undertaking to police the entire world? I think we can. I am not insensible to the fact that there is a limitation to our capacity in manpower, in finances, and in any other field you want to mention. No one can be insensible to it today when you stop to figure the fever, turbulence, and problems you have everywhere in the world. But these are ideals and these are objectives that I think we can probably serve and I think we are serving them now. I think it is an undertaking to which we were committed.

I hear it said that we ought to stop bombing immediately, project a day, sharpen up your forces, then say to all the world, "On this day we stop; on this day a ceasefire will stop everything. Now, if you, the enemy fail to desist in your hostility, then we shall feel free to use everything at our command in order to bring you to heel."

Well, have we not said some of that already? Oh, I rather think so. We have used a good many countries, like Britain, we used the Hanoi embassy in Moscow, people in Warsaw, and elsewhere, but strangely enough these things have not produced anything yet. The tragedy of it is that I think we have gone pretty far but, Mr. President, we could get no reciprocal assurances, and that is the stinger.

I am sure we were willing and I am sure that sentiment was conveyed. If only those three crack divisions they had at the demilitarized zone would stay in their place, but Ho Chi Minh and his associates would give no such assurance. What would you deduce from it? If you would stop the only leverage we have now, those troops would have moved. And what about the Marines on the outside and north of the demilitarized zone? What about those who could become the forgotten men? I am not going to forget them. I am not going to see that kind of punishment visited upon them because suddenly we felt we had to stop this bombing business as a kind of last, desperate resort. It may be the war is a one-way street. Everybody discovered that from the day they invented warfare. There is a great troop risk involved when they counsel that kind of action.

But there is something else that ought to engage our recollection and that is what happened in Korea in 1951. We had a brilliant offensive mounted there and we were doing exceedingly well. Then, suddenly, a kind of inertia came into it. In some areas they reported that President Truman had issued a standstill order. He had not. You will not find it in history books or papers. That is not what happened. But the word went out that we were going to settle for the 38th parallel and that deenergized the drive, and as a result it cost us 90,000 casualties.

Do you want to go down that anxious road again? Not me, not me. One lesson in history is enough and with 450,000 men, and perhaps more over there now, no sir, I am not going to expose them to that sort of thing and rue the day that I do it. That will be a hardened memory with which to keep a rendezvous from that day on.

I, for one, do not propose to do it.

In a recent speech, it was stated that we should end our search-and-destroy operations. The Senator has seen the Montagnards when he was in Vietnam last week. We could not bring them in before. Finally we had to go out and find them by searching the hills and the valleys. That was the only real technique we had which was effective for a time. But, it is said, we should stop it. We should end this business of search and destroy.

What kind of posture does it put us in? A defensive posture.

The moment we are on the defensive, we can no longer employ a technique of this kind. Is that what we want to do? Is that what we want to say to General Westmoreland and our troops out there? I do not.

Sooner or later the truth has got to come to the American people.

A great point was made about taking all this to the Security Council. That matter was argued in this Chamber for hours on yesterday, as if it had not been up there. They made a real endeavor. We have to get nine votes. Yes, there is no veto power where a procedural matter is involved, and this would be procedural. But, we could not get them. We could not energize the members of the Council to take a real interest in it.

Suppose, however, we did get nine votes. What would be the next step? Not procedural. It would have to be substantive.

How do we get a substantive matter out of the Council, with the Soviet Union sitting there with a veto?

I do not think we have looked all the way down that road. Inquiry leads me to believe that our Ambassador to the United Nations, Arthur Goldberg, has not been wanting in trying to get some kind of action in the Security Council. He has not been successful.

Thus, Mr. President, in all the discussion had on yesterday, I do not think it came to anything because I doubt very much whether it was pursued to a real conclusion.

I fairly shuddered when the two newspaper editors, Ashmore and Baggs, finally got visas from the State Department and went out to Hanoi.

If I had been the State Department, they would not have gotten any visas, because they are both associated, as I understand it, with the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, in Santa Barbara. That is where Robert Hutchins, former president of the University of Chicago, is. Senators should read some of the stuff that comes out of that center. I sent for and got lots of it. I delivered quite a lecture on one. The subject was "Justice for All, Freedom for None."

I wish I had my notebook with me so that I could read a few of the notes—they would knock your hats off as to what they had in mind as to the ultimate in a free society. Their idea was that our free society would have to be restructured, that there could be no freedom any more. Justice, yes.

But, I say, what will happen when freedom goes?

What is that old ditty—

No man escapes when freedom falls.
The best men rot in filthy jails.
And those who cry "appease, appease."
Are hanged by those they sought to please.

Mr. President, that is one reason why our boys are in Vietnam. Let freedom slip, and it begins to slip everywhere.

We remember that Churchill said he was not made the King's first minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire.

Let me say that I was not made a Senator to preside over the liquidation of the holy fabric of freedom. May I be the last ever to approach that kind of task.

Well, Mr. President, Ashmore and Baggs go out there. I followed that pretty closely. I thought perhaps they were really going to "pin one on." But read between the lines. What and how much did they get out of Hanoi, if we stopped bombing? It could have eventuated into something. Not that it would. It just could. They came back emptyhanded. But they had enough for a few headlines.

I consigned Ashmore and Baggs to the wastebasket. I received a letter from them exhorting me for identifying them with the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

Well, Mr. President, they have not heard the last of it, I say to my friends of California. They will hear a lot more on that subject before I get through, because if this is going to be the new politics in our country, predicated on the theory that freedom must be liquidated, then the time to start fighting is now.

Thus, I just "kiss off" Ashmore and Baggs after their escapades on the front pages. I doubt very much whether they will make any significant history from now on.

Now I get back to one more point, and then I think I have said enough.

In 1952 we actually went abroad to bring the grand captain back, made him the head of our party and elected him to the Presidency of the United States. We reelected him in 1956. If there had been no constitutional prohibition on a third term, I make so bold as to say that Dwight D. Eisenhower had sufficient of the trust, esteem, and confidence of the American people to be elected for a third time.

Thus, it would occur to me that we who have been associated with him in a common party, we who have gone to see him so often at the Tuesday morning sessions at the White House, could very well, when we are baffled and troubled by problems of this kind, when we are disconcerted of spirit in what appears on the outside to be a kind of party dissidence, we could take a little more counsel from him because he is a great tactician and a great strategist. He is now at that age where he can speak with a wealth of wisdom and experience.

I can only hope that we do not wander too far afield so that, somehow, we go across that yet undefined line under which we might arrogate to ourselves the conduct of the war.

It is a rather interesting thing—I have run down many legal cases before the Supreme Court—that I have found as yet no delimitation on the powers of the

Commander in Chief under the Constitution. Thus, I want to abide by that Constitution. I do not want him to invade our responsibility and I do not want to invade his. When he wants counsel, he can call—and he does; how many times we have been to the White House with the maps and the charts looking over them to see where we are and getting some better ideas about direction. Then we knew, I think, a little better, for our own comfort and the stability of our soul, what we should do.

So, Mr. President, that is the whole story. I am not disposed to argue it, as I said at the outset. I want to be sure only that I comport myself according to my own convictions and my own conscience, because I have a responsibility to myself, to my country, and to those boys who are out there in Vietnam now.

May we pray for them always. May we make no mistakes that will add an undue burden on, and an undue jeopardy to, a task which in itself is amply hazardous without our adding to it.

I do not want our boys in Vietnam to become the forgotten men.

Thus, in every step we take, in every word we utter, let us be sure that we have in mind those men who, at this very moment, are 12,000 miles from this gracious country, who are ready for any sacrifice, who are ready for any vigil, who are ready for any task in order to requite their obligations and responsibilities as soldiers of the United States of America.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, what the distinguished minority leader said needed saying. It was said eloquently. He spoke as an American. I think the American people approve of what he had to say.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it was indeed said eloquently, and, of course, as an American, and I suggest there has not been a word uttered in this Chamber over the last many months that has been uttered by other than an American. I think this is very clear. I do not think any of us who have spoken has had any lack of responsibility or any reason to feel that he was not discharging his obligation to his country or to this body, or to those who are serving on active duty anywhere in the world.

Just as it was proper for the Senator from Illinois to call to the attention of all of us our responsibility not to weaken the cause of our Nation, the cause of freedom in the world, so I think it is equally important for all of us to meet our responsibility, when we disagree with the conduct of affairs by our Government, to state that disagreement as clearly and distinctly as possible, whether in time of peace or in time of war.

The strength of our democracy depends upon this being done, because people in high office can make errors as can people of humble station.

The only way to guard against error in what is at best an imperfect world, in the conduct of affairs by men who are at best less than omniscient, as they should be less than omnipotent, is to encourage, certainly not to condemn or seek to stifle, criticism of a responsible nature by all citizens, including Members of the Senate of the United States.

(At this point Mr. SPONG assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have listened to the distinguished minority leader with a great deal of interest. All of us have very deep respect and affection for the Senator from Illinois, and certainly I have always counted myself as one of those who admire him very much. He has great talents and I particularly enjoy his company. It pains me very much to have a different view on such an important matter of policy.

I have not the slightest doubt that he has the deepest conviction when he says he is not a Senator to liquidate the holy fabric of freedom. I am sure he feels that way. I feel just as strongly that the pursuit of this war under the conditions that exist is more likely designed to liquidate the holy fabric of freedom because of what could well be a war of indefinite tenure, indefinite existence, and possibly involve China.

So what we are arguing about is not the objective. I think the objective of the Senator from Illinois and that of myself and those of us who disagree with the current policy in Vietnam are identical. We do have this difference of judgment, and it is a judgment based upon similar facts, as to the best way to go about preserving our freedom.

The Senator expressed his very deep feeling for the men in Vietnam. All of us share that. There are men from every State represented by everyone in this body, and we are all getting, almost daily, notices of their death or injury. The difference is, I think, that those of us who would like to liquidate this war believe that we are acting in the interest of those men in Vietnam. We do not wish them to stay there. Also, we believe it is not in the national interest to do so.

So it seems to me the question is narrowed a bit if we get down to some of the issues that are related to this question. What is the objective of this Vietnam policy? Is it in the interest of this country and the preservation of our strength?

The Senator intimates, in one section of his speech, that our security is involved. Yesterday I said I thought our security was best protected by maintaining a strong country, and not wasting or spending our resources, manpower, and money, in South Vietnam. This is not a part of the world which it seems to me has ever been regarded heretofore as strategic and as of vital importance to the United States.

The Senator from Illinois mentioned President Eisenhower, a great general. When President Eisenhower was in office, this matter was presented to him in 1954. He very carefully selected his Chiefs of Staff, General Ridgway and General Gavin. They undertook a study of the landing problems in support of the French in Vietnam. Very wisely, after a thorough examination, General Ridgway recommended against it, although there were powerful people in that administration, including the Secretary of State, and Admiral Radford, who were for it. But President Eisenhower, exercising his responsibility as President, decided against it. I think history will prove him right.

General MacArthur had made a statement, not under these same circumstances, but after what had been his experience in the same area to the effect that it would be very foolish to engage in a land war on the continent of Asia.

I believe there are other leading military men who have taken that view. There has been a difference of opinion among the highest branches of the military establishment on this particular problem. But General Eisenhower at least made a decision not to go into that precise area, Vietnam. I believe at that time there was the question of landing in North Vietnam, but, anyway, it was in the general area of Vietnam, and he decided not to go to the aid of the French.

We were at that time in a false position in supporting a colonial power, which is contrary to the tradition of this country. I think this whole operation from the beginning has been afflicted with this weakness. The idea that Vietnam would threaten the security of this country by bombs or other means is not realistic.

I assume that what the Senator is saying is that Russia and/or China will use it as a base to attack us. I do not know what other reason would lead us to say that what happens in South Vietnam is a real and direct threat to the security of the United States.

If it is Russia that is the threat, I do not see how Russia needs Vietnam to be a threat to the United States. At any rate, Russia, not so long ago, had missiles in Cuba and withdrew them. If she is determined on such an attack, I do not know why she withdrew those missiles in Cuba.

This gets us into a very involved matter as to motives. With due respect, I do not see how what the Senator thinks will happen in South Vietnam is a threat to us. I agree with what the Senator said about the recent election and that the votes were cast, but most people agree that the conditions for the voting were determined by us and our proteges. It seems to me this would be quite similar to having a rule in Arkansas that only Democrats could be elected. I would feel that I would come out pretty well under those conditions and we could count the votes as they were cast.

But coming back to the matter of security, which I commented on yesterday—and I assume perhaps the Senator from Illinois had that in mind, because I said I thought that we are playing the Communist game—if that is what is involved, and I think it certainly is involved in the long term, I think that we are weakening this country. I think there is evidence that this country, not just in the Senate, but in the polls, and the speeches, the statements of recognized and respectable people—they are not all peculiar people who are evidencing dissent in this matter—there is great confusion and much difference of opinion. But judging from recent speeches by responsible Members of this body, I particularly think it significant that some of the Republican Members are reflecting their own maturity of judgment, and also, presumably, that of their constitu-

ents. I think that is a very healthy thing. I think this is the proper role of the minority party in any government, to take that position, to refine the issues, and to contribute to a refinement of policy which I hope will be wiser than the one we are following.

I do not think even the Senator from Illinois is pleased with our present situation. It is a very disagreeable thing, even though he supports the present policy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Before the Senator gets too far away from Ridgway and Gavin—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will yield for a question, but I do not wish to lose the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think we have got to keep our history straight here. The Senator drew upon history. Let me state my version.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is based upon having been in North Vietnam in 1953. I was at Hanoi. I saw our Navy planes, that we had given to the French, take off in the hope that they could save Dienbienphu, the last French stronghold, as the Senator knows.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They did not save it. The French got licked.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Notwithstanding the fact that we poured 700 million American dollars into their effort.

Now, why were they there? They had been there; Indochina, as it was then known, was under French tutelage for more than 90 years.

They did not even train people to run the government. They were willing to train doctors only because of tropical diseases. They were there to conquer, not to preserve the freedom of a humble people. They were really there to subdue them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That may have been their motive.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, it was the case.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But I daresay they did not cause nearly the destruction, in the 90 years they were there, that we have caused in 2 years. I am sure they did not kill anything like as many people, nor disrupt the economy and the life of the people in Vietnam as much.

I do not mean that we have done this because of bad motives; we have done it through lack of wisdom, I will say.

But if I may come back to it, the question which I think is central, and which we are really interested in, is what policy really serves the interests of this country. Surely just what kind of government they may have in South Vietnam is not of such importance to us as to justify our risking 500,000 men. We have already suffered 15,000 deaths, and nearly 85,000 casualties. To compare that loss to our interest in the kind of government in a little country that has never before had a representative government, and say that we must give them precisely what we think they ought to have, does not make any sense to me.

It is the question of our security, I think, that is of central importance. Surely we could agree that all that we

are doing is not worthwhile, simply to give this little country representative government, or a democratic government, if you like, in which they elect people in the same fashion we do in Chicago, or in Harlem, or in Arkansas. Whether it is necessary to the security of this country, seems to me to be the crucial point.

I cannot see that it is crucial to our security. On the contrary, when you consider the cost that we are now undergoing, and what we have already suffered—the Senator knows how much we are spending; it is now estimated at the rate of \$30 billion a year. The casualty rate is twice as high this year as it was last year. We have already suffered, this year, more casualties than in all of last year. The rate is going up, and will continue to go up if the war is intensified, one would suppose.

Is it worth the cost? It seems to me that it could be only if this is a very strategic area, from the point of the security of this country. I cannot see that the proponents of the war have made a case, their argument does not appeal to me. I would be most interested, if anyone can make that point.

On the contrary, as I said yesterday, the Chinese first stated this thought, and I think it has some validity: If we were not there, they could not challenge the United States; they have no air force worthy of the name—the Chinese, I am speaking of now, not South Vietnam—that neither South Vietnam nor North Vietnam have anything that they could attack us with is self-evident. The Chinese have no air force, they have no navy worthy of the name; they have, we presume, a very primitive nuclear weapon, but no delivery system, as of now.

In addition to that, while we have apparently built up great fear and apprehension about it, there is nothing, really, in the record, in our hearings, or anywhere else that I have heard of, indicating any fervent desire on the part of the Chinese to attack us in the foreseeable future. That will depend, of course, a great deal upon the way we conduct ourselves, in regard to China.

But what we are doing is sending our men over there and having them slaughtered. We are spending our money, we are disrupting our economy, we are threatened with inflation, we are confronted with an enormous deficit; I do not know what is going to be done about the tax bill, but the news in the papers every day says it will have very hard sledding. If that does not come through, there will be a deficit of some \$28 or \$30 billion. That will cause further disruption here.

Then there is the division within our country, the lack of unity and cooperation among our citizens, in carrying out our policies domestic as well as foreign, which is a very serious thing for a great and powerful country of this kind. The alienation of the young people—you can laugh all you like at hippies, but it is not just hippies. I have been to a number of universities where there are no hippies, or at least there are very few. The most responsible and intelligent young people of this country do not support this war,

by and large. They have given every evidence of it in practically every university in the country.

Not that that in itself is decisive, but it is indicative of a lack of justification for this war. It has not been made a self-evident fact of life that it is in our interest to pursue this war.

There was no question of this sort in the Second World War. There was very little question in Korea. There was certainly none in the First World War. Why is it that there is such a great question now? Could it not be possible that the feeling of those who oppose this war could have some validity? Might that not be indicated by the fact that it is shared by so many people in this country?

All of us are elected here. I do not think that my fellow Senators who have expressed their opposition to the continuation of this particular war—and I say "this particular war" because it is not like any of the other wars which have been mentioned—completely ignore the views of their constituents.

To make it out that Ho Chi Minh is like Hitler is nonsense. He has none of the characteristics. His country has none of the power, or characteristics of power, that Germany had, and so on. That kind of an analogy makes no sense whatever to me. We have to judge it on the facts of this case; and it seems very strange to me that so many people in this country, of all types and characters, dissent from the pursuit of this particular war and the fashion in which we are pursuing it. I think it is something to give the Senate pause, and I believe that we should all participate, as are the Senator from Illinois, and his colleagues on his side of the aisle, and those of us on this side of the aisle, in discussing this problem.

I think the Senator has rendered a great service in opening up the subject. He always attracts attention to these problems, much more than any other Senator can, because of his own very special talents, which we all appreciate. But I think it is a very fine thing to discuss it, if we can arrive—and I hope we can—at an agreement about where the real interests, the vital security interests of this country lie, and what pursuits, what policies, would best promote them. If we could arrive at such an agreement, it would be the greatest favor we could render, not only to the President, but to this country.

The suggestions about using the United Nations, it seems to me, are entirely appropriate. We helped to create that body. We have been its principal sponsor. I do not think the suggestions that have been made should be dismissed because, in the past, the United Nations has not been able to solve all these problems. I think it should be given a real try. And I do not think we have yet given it a real try, partly because of the feeling that it is futile. Under the serious conditions that now exist, I do not believe that we should refrain from doing anything possible, and I do not think we have, to obtain the agreement of the Security Council to put this matter on the agenda and have it discussed, and hopefully to have some resolution of it, with the assistance of the members of the Security Council.

I can only say that I hope all Senators will do as have the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from California, and others, in talking about this matter and seeking to resolve it.

All the other matters that we have before us seem to be connected with Vietnam—the foreign aid program has been affected by it, and almost all the other matters that have come before my committee. This morning we had a meeting on the Asian Development Bank. All of the consideration comes around to the question of what is going to happen to Vietnam. Unless we can resolve this, it is like a cancer eating into all our other policies. I think everybody knows that it is affecting our budget. It affects the tax bill. All of these matters relate to Vietnam.

If the Members of the Senate cannot discuss it and hopefully come to some agreement upon it by a clear majority, the country is going to be more and more divided. We are going to get in deeper and deeper trouble.

I do not know what the answer is. We have to make some agreement on it, it seems to me. It is an intolerable situation for the most powerful country in the world with all its vast resources at its disposal to be in this position, apparently not able to make up its mind. Its mind is not made up. Even though the President has control, he cannot carry on indefinitely without the real support of the country. I think we can agree to that.

Difficulties will arise in other fields. Difficulties have already arisen in other fields. They are not directly affected, but are indirectly affected by Vietnam.

So, I could not overexaggerate the importance of the Senate continuing the discussion and coming to some resolution. I do not quite see how we can come to a resolution, but we ought to be able to come to a resolution and a high degree of agreement as to where our interests are.

Is it in the interest of this country to pursue the war indefinitely with the escalating cost of money and lives? Is it in the interest of this country to bring the war to a close by some kind of compromise?

I do not think that approach has been explored as it should be, certainly through the U.N.

I commend the Senator for at least bringing up the question for proper discussion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, certain it is that any war develops stresses, spiritual, moral, and emotional, that very often impel many people to take a given course of action. Even in the War Between the States it was so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That was the trouble.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The party of Lincoln, decided that there would be a rump convention and that they would not nominate the Commander in Chief.

The person who then corresponded to the Republican national chairman today besought Lincoln with every talent he had to try to do something to get the soldiers back before the November election and to get this thing over and to receive some negotiators from the South.

I think history will bear this out, that Lincoln met aboard ship two of them that had been brought through the lines.

Lincoln listened very carefully and then he took a piece of paper. At the top he wrote:

- No. 1. The Union must be preserved.
- No. 2. Slavery must be abolished.

He then said:

Gentlemen, you fill in the rest of it, the disposition of the horses, the military material, the feed stocks, all of that. You write that in there, but just leave No. 1 and No. 2 at the top, and I will sign it.

You see, we are up against a decision of some kind. No. 1. Do we quit? Do we retreat? Do we go ahead to a victory? Do we deescalate? And if we do, I think that we throw away whatever leverage we have?

What is the answer? I am content to go along in the interest of our troops with that position that does not forfeit our leverage in the hope that there can be negotiation and put it on thicker and thicker if necessary.

I learned long ago that it is the hit dog that yelps. They are being hit. They are being hurt, and they are beginning to yelp.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What does the Senator have in mind as the final outcome in this area? What does he want to achieve in Vietnam? Does he want a colony?

I wonder what the Senator has in mind that we wish to have there in the foreseeable future.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Do we have any commitment under the Southeast Asian Treaty?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not to do what we are doing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What are the commitments? It is a protocol state.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They are to cooperate with the other members of the Southeast Asian Treaty as to what course we should take. There was no guarantee that we were to come to their aid in South Vietnam.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No commitment as to self-determination?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think you had better reexamine that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We have reexamined it. That is the opinion of a number of experts who appeared before our committee. I may say that the Secretary of State never used that as an excuse until about a year and a half ago. They gave other reasons.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Maybe there was not an occasion for it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That was only involved in a minor way until we began to escalate the number of troops.

I wonder what the Senator has in mind. Does he think the United States security requires us to have a permanent presence in Southeast Asia or South Vietnam?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I said nothing about a permanent presence. I mentioned, and I presume the Senator was present, that

I probably have a different military concept in that we have an outside perimeter than runs from Korea to Vietnam. If that is there, what about the rest of Southeast Asia? And we will have to include Australia, New Zealand, Burma, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Laos, and Cambodia. They are all part of it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Do I then understand that the Senator believes a permanent base there is necessary for our security?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. I think that after stability is restored at long last, they can set up their own military requirements in order to meet this threat.

Perhaps the Senator does not share my conviction that this is a Red threat. This is a Communist threat that proposes to liquidate freedom in South Vietnam.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish the Senator would explore that a little further.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does it need any explanation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it does. By way of background, a moment ago it was stated that this area of Indochina was a colony of France. France took it about 1870 or thereabouts, and they held it until they were forced out in 1954. And the leader then was Ho Chi Minh, the leader of the nationalist forces which really defeated the French.

Mr. DIRKSEN. You stated why the French troops were there.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was a colony of France. That is why they were there. It was a colony, and they were trying to maintain it as a possession which they exploited for its national wealth.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It was colonialism at its very worst.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know that it was different from all the other French possessions. They exploited it as they always have and as most colonial powers do.

What I am coming to is what do we have in mind? The Senator says that we do not have in mind maintaining a permanent presence there, and that it will not be a colony.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not think there is any doubt. This is a Communist threat. I do not want to see that line broken so that all of the rest of Southeast Asia is exposed, because if it is, then the whole Pacific coastline of this country will be exposed.

If that does not involve security, then I have no understanding of the word.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator is making a real contribution. At least, we understand each other. If I understand the Senator, he thinks we should have a permanent presence there.

This, of course, leads to different conclusions. I do not wish to misinterpret myself or misinterpret the Senator's words. If that is true—and I gather from what the Senator said that it is—then certainly my theory is quite wrong. I mean, I do not agree with that view at all. I do not believe that would promote the security of this country. I believe that the security of this country would be better promoted, rather than establishing a colony there in place of the French, to

have Vietnam a strong, independent country. I think we made a great mistake in intervening there.

I believe the analogy of Yugoslavia is a very sound one. Vietnam would have been a Communist country, but an independent country; because they have had a thousand years of history, fighting the Chinese, to avoid becoming a satellite; and they succeeded in that up until the French took them.

This is an important difference. The President has never said that. I do not know whether the Senator means to say that or not, but I gather that he did say that. Am I correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I said it; yes, I did.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. You did?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. And yesterday you said our security is not involved at all. It depends on whether or not you take a global view of security. If you do not, the chances are that you are right. I take a different view, because we have conquered time, space, and distance to the point where this is a pretty small world.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with that, and that is the reason why I think what I consider an obsolete concept of colonial bases is no longer adequate for security in this kind of world. I think we have to find new ways, particularly ways of working with countries such as Russia, rather than competing with them for bases in outposts such as South Vietnam. I think this is bound to bring a clash, bound to bring a nuclear exchange, which will not be in the interest of this country or any other country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, that is a speculation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What is a speculation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. What you just said. It is a speculation into the future, as to whether there will be a nuclear clash.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. You mean if we do not find a way to get along with Russia, it is speculation that there will be a clash?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is still a speculation in proportion, as I have seen these figures put on a blackboard in a good many places, as to how many people will be killed if they unleash nuclear exchanges, and whose people will be killed in greater numbers, and they run up into the millions. I cannot believe that mankind has so sloughed off its compassion and its commonsense as to get into that kind of a hole—yet.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think they do it deliberately.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, no.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We have rarely got into wars deliberately. You blunder into these wars. And what we are doing in assuming the mantle of the British Empire, and in beginning to accumulate bases such as Vietnam, is to expose us to the same kind of troubles the British had, to a gradual erosion of our power and of our influence. We have already, I think, lost the sympathy of Western Europe in this policy—not because they do not have great respect for this country as such, as a great country, but they question our judgment in pursuing this war, which they believe is undermining the strength of this country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I cannot believe that mankind will blunder into this sort of thing. We did not blunder into it in Hiroshima or Nagasaki. That was done after the most prayerful deliberation. And when it was done, they picked up the pieces, assessed the damage, saw how many people were killed, and how by nuclear weapons you can convert a cool, placid river into a boiling stream. That is not lost on the leaders anywhere in the world, and I cannot imagine that they are going to blunder into that sort of thing.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Well, of course, I wish I had the same faith the Senator has, even though we continue the policies we have now that apparently inspire his allegiance to this policy in Southeast Asia, which is to fight off this Red menace, that he at the same time thinks they are going to be so reasonable that they will never engage in a nuclear war. I think you are trying to have it both ways. If they are as dangerous a menace as you would lead us to believe because of Vietnam, then, surely, we could have no assurance that they would not use nuclear weapons.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They know that nobody ever won an earthquake, and they are not going to blunder into this.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not see why the Senator thinks that they are behind Vietnam and that this is a step intended to attack us.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They are certainly behind North Vietnam. Have you any doubt about Soviet weapons over there?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, no. But they are helping an ally, in the same way we have helped allies. That does not mean the Soviets are intending to use South Vietnam or North Vietnam as a stepping-stone to attack us.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We are not over there to conquer anybody.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why not? You just said we are going to have a base there.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not say we are going to have a base there.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was trying to develop what the Senator did say.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I certainly did not. We are over there to help South Vietnam preserve their Republic, their freedom, their self-determination, and, over and above everything else, freedom from aggression.

Now, why is the Soviet Union helping North Vietnam? For freedom's reasons? No. To conquer South Vietnam. That is the difference. It is certainly a sharp difference in principle.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Well, of course, I need not tell you about this idea of aggression—the other side believes we are the aggressor. We have intervened in a civil war, a war between Vietnamese. The Senator does not deny that. These are all basically Vietnamese.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Basically, yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And we do not live there, and it is a foreign country, and we intervened.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What would have been the situation if the Chinese had sent a hundred thousand men over here during our Civil War?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad I do not have to speculate on that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a civil war; and the assumption that everybody believes that this is an outright aggression by one national state or another is open to question; is it not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It seems to me that from the very days of Ngo Dinh Diem—and I had many meetings with him when I was there—they were just trying to set up a republic to suit themselves. They were content to leave their neighbors to the north alone. That did not satisfy Ho Chi Minh—not on your life. He was going to bring all of what was ancient Indochina into the fold, no matter what it cost. That was the conflict.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All we tried to do in the South, since the Senator referred to the Lincoln principle, was to set up our own government, if the North would leave us alone, but the North would not do that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The North did not try to conquer the South. We had a Constitution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But we did set up a Confederacy, yet the North insisted on conquering us anyhow.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, we did not; we took exception to Calhoun's Doctrine of Nullification and said that the South just could not walk out.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what Ho Chi Minh said to Diem.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Ho Chi Minh had nothing to say.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He thought he should have.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is a different thing.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Just as Lincoln thought he should have.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, Lincoln did not. Lincoln was guided by the Constitution that applied to the Senator's State as well as it applied to his own State. The South walked out on it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Before I sit down, I should like to have a clarification. I understood the Senator to say that we needed a base; that we intended South Vietnam to be a permanent base for the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I said that, I would have opened up the whole subject of colonialism, which is as alien as anything I know of to our concept of government.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not want to prolong the discussion, but I should like to clarify the question. What does the Senator say is the objective of our war in Vietnam? What is it that we wish to achieve that is worthy of what we are doing?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I mentioned security. Obviously, it would take a long military lecture of global dimensions to persuade my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I mean what concrete effect would result in Vietnam?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Did I not recite the right of those people to decide their destiny for themselves, particularly their political destiny?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Are we going to leave Vietnam?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We undertook to fulfill

a commitment under the SEATO Treaty, while we did not ask for much in Geneva in 1954, I think we came away from there somewhat with the idea that if they had to have help and asked us for it, we would help. What happened?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did not Diem ask us for help? We put him in office; he was "our boy."

Mr. DIRKSEN. We did not put him in; the people of South Vietnam put him there. Diem went around the countryside, talking to South Vietnamese farmers, rice farmers, and everyone else. He was a very popular person. I listened to him when he was on the platform at the time. We did not put him in; he put himself in.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator mean to say that Diem was elected in a free election?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I mean that he undertook, by going around the country, to get the trust and confidence of the people there. Then, too, of course, there had to be a leader to take over somewhere along the line. Who was a more natural leader than Ngo Dinh Diem? But we did not put him in.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The fact is that he created such a dictatorship that we had to come to his aid and support him all the time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sorry to say that that case has been badly exaggerated.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is a very grave difference of opinion as to the historical fact.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But it is clear that the Senator does not wish us to incorporate this as a colony or a military base. He said that. And he does not wish us to be there permanently.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How often must I say that we do not go in for colonialization at all? As for setting up a base there, if I know the meaning of the word—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There are people who say we have set up bases there.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator says there are people. I have not heard them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has not heard them?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, sir.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it is very important to clarify what our purposes are in Vietnam. I would put it this way to see if it comes closer to the Senator's thought. The Senator says that we guarantee the right of self-determination, that they had an election, and that it was a good election. Why if that is so do we not leave or turn it over to them?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have an enemy up there and we have to make sure—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That means we stay.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What does the Senator want to do? He has not heard me quarreling with what we have done. He has been quarreling for the last year about the conduct of the war.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What does the Senator want to do?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have said it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Tell the Senate. Does the Senator want to quit now and pull out?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What I would like to see happen—whether it will happen this way I do not know—is a reconvening of the Geneva conference, and our agreeing to abide by the result. We did not agree the last time at the last minute. We refused to agree.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We were not even a signatory.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Nobody was. There was agreement to it, and we refused to agree. We can neither claim rights under it nor claim other people's rights under it. The Senator is correct. We were not a signatory.

I would like to see a return to the principles of the Geneva conference. The President himself, at about the time of his speech at Johns Hopkins, said that was a proper basis. The North Vietnamese, have said that was a proper basis. I would like to see that, and a negotiation under the cochairmanship of Great Britain and Russia; and that they come to an agreement as to a way to have elections, full and free elections, throughout South Vietnam to create their government; and we would come home.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has the Senator heard Ho Chi Minh ask for a reconvening of the Geneva Conference?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; but I have not heard us either. This is what I would like to see happen.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He is the guy taking the pasting. He is the guy being pushed around.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; and so are we.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why not ask, and see what the reaction is?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The reason is that he feels he has been unjustly attacked. I regret very much that he has not responded to these offers we have made. I think he is wrong for his benefit and for our benefit. Do not misunderstand me. What does Ho Chi Minh have at stake? A little God-forsaken country of 15 million or 16 million people.

We are threatening the security of the strongest country in the world, on which other countries depend economically, politically, and morally. This is a great undertaking and a great risk.

The Senator's expression of a moment ago reassured me when he said he was not a Senator to liquidate the holy fabric of freedom. Neither am I, but I think the course we are following will do it in the bitter end. We are expending this for what? Suppose we take all of Vietnam. Is it worth it? The price we are paying for this is all out of proportion to anything we can gain. We cannot do all of this. At least 15 or 30 million people have an election. That is not the kind of objective to justify this.

There is surely something more that the Senator has in mind. I was trying to develop it. Is it to have a permanent base? The Senator said "No."

Mr. DIRKSEN. No.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has not mentioned anything yet to make me believe that this is worth what we are doing. That is about the sum and substance of it.

Therefore, I think we should return to the Geneva Conference and liquidate this war on the same basis the parties

really involved, which were the French and the Vietnamese, agreed to in 1954, which we had a major part in disrupting and preventing from being carried out.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I see no reason for continuing this. I tried to emphasize my concept of our security line from Saigon and Vietnam to Korea. I still believe in the general field of global strategy that is our defense line, and if we lose it by having the flank turned, that means the line is shortened and the Pacific will no longer be a real defense to our country. As for freedom, it is an indivisible as well as a holy fabric. When it is impaired in one place, that impairment continues.

What about the people in our country like those associated with the Center for Democratic Institutions, who, for instance, belabor the line "Justice for all, freedom for none." They would liquidate freedom.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator mentions freedom. What does the Senator say about Greece? Here is one of our old allies, and suddenly freedom is snuffed out, like that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; it is not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course it is. I read just recently in the newspaper that a former minister there made a statement critical of the government and the next day they arrested him. One woman refused to print a newspaper under censorship and they threatened her with arrest. There are 50 members of the Parliament who are still in jail.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is only within the last 2 weeks that the newly elected Supreme, they call him, of the American Hellenic Organization, which is referred to as AHEPA, Mr. Andrew Fasseas of Chicago, who is president of the national association, has returned from Greece. He has been in my office. If ever there was a devotee of freedom he is. I have not heard him say yet they have been deluded of their freedom.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator think there is a free government in Greece?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, I do. Just because they have a military junta for a specific purpose for a little while to shove back the Communist influence—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Communist influence?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Surely, and it has been trying to move into Greece.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator saying that the previous government was a Communist government?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not say anything about the previous government. You can have a new government move in without there being a Communist government. We have Communists in this country, do we not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a minor affair.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It may not be as minor as the Senator thinks. I am having trouble trying to take the bill off the Calendar to reenergize the Subversive Activities Control Board, only to be met with resistance in this Chamber, and probably more when the authorization for State, Justice, and Commerce comes here, when every veterans organization

in the country is for it, so that the Board can go through. Yet, the Assistant Attorney General went before the committee and said there are 100 cases over at the Department of Justice that should be submitted to the Control Board. It is not a government. The influence, however, is here. Perhaps the Senator does not—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a minor one, I think. It is here. If we continue to follow policies as misguided as the present one, it will grow. I have not heard J. Edgar Hoover say recently that he was as much disturbed about it as he was 20 years ago.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Once upon a time it was minor. It was minor in Albania, Rumania, and Poland. But it is not minor any more. It has swallowed up all those countries.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator think the Communists are threatening this country?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I say that communism is threatening the world. If it is not, then why this imbroglio in Vietnam?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is a pertinent question. I was under the impression that since the death of Stalin, the drive of that branch—not the Chinese—was receding. It certainly has become less aggressive.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Did the Senator get that idea from Kossygin's visit?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The strength of these parties, for example, in Western Europe, is not so powerful now as it used to be. In France and Italy it is still a major party. In France and Italy, about 25 percent of the electorate is Communist, although both countries have been making substantial economic and political progress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What were the gains reported in the press made by the Communists in France?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Where?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I saw a little subhead on it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In what country?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thought it was in France. I will look it up.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not even know they had an election in France.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It was a local election.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I saw a report on the elections in Bremen, Germany, where the right wing gained a little there. I saw that in this morning's paper. But I did not realize that communism is on the march, so to speak, nearly so much now as it was under Stalin.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It has never been off the march.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As a relative matter, it is not so aggressive as it used to be. We have made considerable progress in various ways in adjusting to the Russians. The Senator himself, I believe, finally relented and supported the Consular Treaty this year. To me, that is just an indication. Not that the treaty is significant in itself, but it is an indication.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would the Senator like to tell the rest of the story about the Consular Treaty?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was mentioning only that it was approved by the Senate. The press said—and I do not want to misquote without checking—that the

Senator from Illinois did not positively oppose it. I think the Senator was right. Do not misunderstand me, I thought this was a sign of a degree of relaxation of the kind of fear and apprehension that afflicted us at the height of the Stalin era. I think we were quite justified in being apprehensive because Stalin was a very determined and resourceful man. But I think, since then, there has been a lessening of pressure, a relaxation of that conflict, that they are moving themselves internally more toward a different and more relaxed system.

Mr. DIRKSEN. All that has exactly nothing to do with it. I am sure that we can imagine the man who sat in my office—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And brought us all that information which I could not even discuss.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator is quite correct. I did not mean to criticize him. I merely meant to say I thought this was a sign that he accepted a change or an evolution taking place in the Communist world. I think in the Kremlin and in Eastern Europe there are signs of it. China is in a class by itself.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It was not a sign at all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Just coming to grips with naked reality.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 117. An act for the relief of Martha Blakenhip; and

S. 534. An act for the relief of Setsuko Wilson (nee Hiranaka).

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 1160) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. KORNEGAY, Mr. SPRINGER, and Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House insisted on its amendment to the bill (S. 454) for the relief of Richard K. Jones, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ASHMORE, Mr. HUNGATE, and Mr. SMITH

of New York were appointed as managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 853) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 1564. An act to amend the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

S. 2162. An act to amend the Act of January 17, 1936 (49 Stat. 1094), reserving certain public domain lands in Nevada and Oregon as a grazing reserve for Indians of Fort McDermitt, Nev.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 853) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMERICAN LEGION RESOLUTION ON THE PANAMA CANAL

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the American Legion has long had a history of careful and knowledgeable interest in the foreign relations of the United States. The Legion has never hesitated to come out foursquare on issues in which they believe. But at the same time, they have not done so without the most careful study and analysis of the situation.

The 49th annual convention of the American Legion has passed a series of important resolutions on foreign policy. I have the honor of being foreign relations chairman of the American Legion of South Carolina. It will be my pleasure, therefore, from time to time, to call attention of the Senate to some of these carefully prepared resolutions.

For example, Resolution No. 356 concerns the Panama Canal, a subject which is under active discussion in this Congress. I would like to point out that the Legion once more reiterates its previous positions. It reaffirms support of the existing treaties and opposes any dilution of U.S. rights in the Canal Zone.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the 49th national convention of the American Legion on the Panama Canal be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESOLUTION No. 356

Whereas, The American Legion has repeatedly insisted that the Government of the United States must retain sole and complete authority over the administration, operation, maintenance, and protection of the Panama Canal as provided for in the 1903 Treaty; and

Whereas, the course of U.S.-Panamanian relations has demonstrated that any concessions made on our part in regard to our

rights in the Canal Zone have only led to increased demands by the Panamanians; and

Whereas, the most recent series of negotiations concerning the existing canal and a possible new canal has resulted in three proposed treaties which reportedly, if ratified, would—

(a) abrogate the 1903 Treaty,
(b) substitute a weak and perhaps inefficient form of administration over the present canal,

(c) compromise and probably render impossible our ability to defend the canal in times of crisis (or even to guarantee its security in normal periods),

(d) abandon both our capital investment and its earnings,

(e) give the canal to the Republic of Panama, completely, and unequivocally, on or before the last day of 1999 (just 32 years from now),

(f) provide that the United States—under very limited circumstances but at great cost to this country—might construct a second canal across the Isthmus of Panama, the ownership of which would revert to Panama—at no cost to that country—60 years after its opening, or the year 2067, whichever is earlier; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the American Legion in National Convention assembled in Boston, Massachusetts, August 29, 30, 31, 1967, That The American Legion:

(1) reaffirms its support of the basic and still existing provisions of the 1903 Canal Treaty, and of the continued indispensable sovereign control by the United States over the Canal Zone;

(2) opposes ratification of the proposed treaties in their present form;

(3) opposes any change in U.S. rights in the Canal Zone; and

(4) reiterates its stand taken at previous National Conventions concerning these matters.

(By unanimous consent the following routine business was transacted:)

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,
The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The PRESIDING OFFICER announced that on today, October 3, 1967, the Vice President signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 602. An act to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1966; and

S.J. Res. 109. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation commemorating the 50 years of service to the Nation by the Langley Research Center.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to increase the number of congressional alternates authorized to be nominated for each vacancy at the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF MARINE RESOURCES AND ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1966

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, as amended, to extend the period of time within which the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources is to submit its final report and to provide for a fixed expiration date for the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

ROZA DIVISION, YAKIMA PROJECT, WASHINGTON

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to law, a draft of contract relating to proposed drainage and minor construction work which, together with previously executed contracts, will exceed a total cost of \$200,000 on the Roza Division of the Yakima project, Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THIRD-PREFERENCE AND SIXTH-PREFERENCE CLASSIFICATION FOR CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on third-preference and sixth-preference classification for certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDING OFFICER:

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Diego, California, favoring the enactment of some form of a Federal tax-sharing program; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Westminster, California, favoring the enactment of some form of a Federal tax-sharing program; to the Committee on Finance.

A petition signed by members of the Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO, of the State of Kansas, relating to the provision of jobs, housing, and education to solve the problems of American cities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 12474. An act making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 579).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HATFIELD (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 2498. A bill to amend section 2 of the National Housing Act to facilitate the financing of alterations, repairs, or improvements needed to provide sanitary waste disposal facilities upon, or in connection with the mooring of, houseboats; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 2499. A bill to extend the act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees; to the Committee on Commerce. (See the remarks of Mr. MONRONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. HOLLINGS):

S. 2500. A bill to require a health warning on the labels of bottles containing certain alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. THURMOND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S.J. Res. 114. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 373

Mr. SMATHERS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 12080) to amend the Social Security Act to provide an increase in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide benefits for additional categories of individuals, to improve the public assistance program and programs relating to the welfare and health of children, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 374

Mr. PROXMIER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 11456) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 375 AND 376

Mr. RANDOLPH submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 12080) to amend the Social Security Act to provide an increase in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide benefits for additional categories of individuals, to improve the public assistance program and programs relating to the welfare and health of children, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF AIRCRAFT LOAN GUARANTEES LEGISLATION

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I introduce by request of the Department of Transportation, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated September 15, 1967, from the Honorable Alan S. Boyd, Secretary, Department of Transportation, explaining the history of this legislation, together with the need for its extension be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2499) to extend the act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MONRONEY is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D.C., September 15, 1967.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I submit herewith, for the consideration of the Congress, a bill "To extend the Act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees."

The Aircraft Loan Guarantee Program was established by the enactment of Public Law 85-307, September 7, 1957. It provided for guarantee by the Federal Government of up to 90 percent of private loans to local service, helicopter, Alaskan, Hawaiian and certain Caribbean carriers for the purchase of aircraft. The program was inaugurated because of a desire to assist these carriers in securing financing for replacement of obsolete piston aircraft with new modern equipment. It made it possible for these carriers to finance the acquisition of the new aircraft at the lowest possible cost. The ob-

ject of the program, from the Federal government's view, was to assist these carriers in providing improved service at lower costs and thus reducing subsidy paid by the government.

The program was first authorized for a 5-year period. During that period, through September 7, 1962, twelve carriers received guarantees under the program for loans totalling \$42 million. These loans covered the purchase of 33 F-27's, 2 DC-6's, 14 Convair 240's and 340's, a Boeing 720, 3 Martin 404's and 13 helicopters.

In 1962, the program was extended for an additional 5 years, to September 7, 1967. During that period new loans totalling \$13.3 million were guaranteed for 4 carriers covering the purchase of 3 DC-9's, 4 DC-6's, 2 Hercules 382B's and 4 PC-6A's.

The need for the extension of the program at this time is not as great as the need was for the program initially, or in 1962 when it was last extended, in terms of the number of carriers that will require the assistance of the program or in the number of aircraft loans that are expected to be made in the next 5 years. However, some carriers continue to need the assistance of the program and it is still in the interest of the government to provide the guarantee to those carriers. The fact that the loan guarantee is no longer needed in the degree of 10 years ago attests to the success of the program in aiding the classes of carriers involved toward a sound financial position and demonstrates the wisdom of keeping the program in force until it has served its purpose completely by providing assistance to those carriers still in need of it.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the enactment of this legislation from the standpoint of the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN S. BOYD.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO REQUIRE HEALTH HAZARD LABELING ON CERTAIN ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill on behalf of myself and Senators SMITH, MILLER, MORSE, BENNETT, RANDOLPH, and HOLLINGS. I ask that the bill be appropriately referred and printed in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the most serious health problems in the United States today has received far too little attention. The one to which I refer is the health hazard posed by the consumption of alcoholic beverages.

Alcoholism, long viewed by many as solely a moral issue calling for social censure and punishment, is increasingly being viewed as the serious health problem that it is, requiring the application of the combined skills of medicine, psychiatry, and sociology. Because alcoholism has for so long been considered a moral rather than medical problem, medical science is just now showing an awareness of the severe problems to the physical welfare of the individual which can result from the consumption of alcoholic beverages.

In March of 1966, in his health message to the Congress, President Johnson called for the start of a new program

to counter the health problems created by alcoholism. The President said:

I have instructed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to appoint an Advisory Committee on Alcoholism; establish in the Public Health Service a center for research on the cause, prevention, control and treatment of alcoholism; develop an education program in order to foster public understanding based on scientific fact; and work with public and private agencies on the state and local level to include this disease in comprehensive health programs.

In accordance with the President's directive a National Advisory Committee on Alcoholism was appointed and a new National Center for the Prevention and Control of Alcoholism has been established as a major bureau of the Public Health Service. This recognition of the dimensions of the multitude of health problems involved in alcoholism signals a new approach to a decidedly old, but heretofore neglected, problem.

In April of 1967 the statistical bulletin of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. reported that deaths attributed to alcoholic disorders in the United States were nearly 11,000 annually. Additionally, their research revealed that the reported death rate from alcoholic disorders had risen steadily from 5.5 per 100,000 population in 1950 to 8.7 per 100,000 population in 1964. This amounted to an increase of nearly 60 percent over this short span of time.

It must be remembered that statistics of this nature necessarily refer only to deaths actually reported for the causes listed. It is highly probable, according to the most reliable and informed sources, that the reported mortality from alcoholic disorders do not disclose an altogether accurate reflection of the extent of the problem. Several studies reveal that serious understatement exists in the reporting of deaths associated with alcoholic disorders for several understandable reasons. Because of the social stigma involved, friendly family doctors are frequently reluctant to list the specific cause of death in order to spare the family the unnecessary embarrassment. In many cases, they prefer to list some general cause which gives no clue as to the actual cause of death. In other cases, individuals fall victim to one of the many accidents that drinkers are prone to, such as automobile or household accidents. For these reasons the exact dimensions of the health problem posed by alcoholism, which everyone admits exists, is impossible to state with statistical precision.

While the statisticians may have difficulty in measuring the dimensions of the problem, the medical scientists know that it is one of major proportions. The evidence indicates that alcohol acts as a systemic poison for many individuals which, over the years, results in identifiable physical damage. For a long time, it has been the fashion to accept uncritically the theory that alcoholism was basically a mental disorder. Opinions are now coming around to the belief that alcoholism is the result, as well as the cause, of physical dysfunction in a cycle that seems to begin with the inability of some individuals to metabolize alcohol properly.

It has been estimated that approximately 20 percent of the adult population in the United States is physically susceptible to alcoholism. But, of course, not all of these drink. Of those who do drink statistics indicate that one out of 15 either are now or will become alcoholics regardless of their intelligence, education, or many other factors.

Whatever the cause, the health effects of alcoholism are predictable. Alcoholism stands almost alone in that every system of the body is measurably damaged; other diseases may damage specific systems, but alcoholism damages them all. Most of the damage is non-fatal, but generally three of the body systems may find fatal or permanently crippling damage:

First, the cardiovascular system, comprising the heart and blood vessels; second, the nervous system, comprising the brain, spinal cord and the various nerves running to all parts of the body; and, third, the liver itself.

The frequent drinking of large quantities of alcohol tends to raise the blood level of fats; it may also result in damage to the heart muscle. At any rate, a disproportionate number of alcoholics suffer crippling or fatal heart attacks.

Damage to the nervous system of alcoholics has been observed for centuries. Numbness in hands and feet, frequent tremors, discernible differences in brain wave patterns, and rapid brain cell damage are phenomena associated with advanced stages of the disease. As a person grows older, his brain cells die and are absorbed. Fortunately, the normal person has a reserve supply of thousands of more cells than he needs. The alcoholic literally destroys his brain, resulting in the well-known effects of delirium tremens, complete loss of memory, and mental incapacity.

Not all alcoholics progress to this state, however. Most of them die from other causes, principally cirrhosis of the liver. Cirrhosis appears eight times more frequently among alcoholics than among nonalcoholics. Although malnutrition in the alcoholic is frequently the cause of this damage, in more recent years it has been found that alcohol itself has the capacity to cause liver cell damage even if the diet is adequate.

Despite these physically identifiable health hazards, it has long been the practice to label the alcoholic instead of alcohol. Alcoholism has been equated with mental illness with the assumption that once a patient's neurosis was cured, his alcoholism would go away. The fact seems to be that for a predictable segment of our population alcohol is a systemic poison whose progressively devastating effects can be halted only by a complete cessation of drinking alcoholic beverages. For the majority of drinkers alcohol has a mild, anesthetic effect which has been judged acceptable by the majority of our citizens. However, the unwitting minority is faced with a serious health hazard.

The chief problem is the problem of education. Few people today are aware that different individuals may face different hazards in drinking. The general public, both those who drink and those who do not, assume that holding to the

norm of infrequent social drinking is simply a matter of willpower and choice. The man with a physical susceptibility for alcoholism is unaware that he is exposing himself to dangers that his social drinking companions do not face.

Unfortunately, the impression of socially acceptable drinking is fostered by the \$15 billion-a-year alcoholic beverage industry. Studies by the Brand Rating Index, an independent survey organization, show that nearly 50 percent of the sales of alcoholic beverages is consumed by approximately 6 percent of the population that are heavy drinkers. The vast majority of these heavy drinkers are alcoholics. This means that the alcoholic beverage industry profits from exploiting the misfortune of sick people.

Not surprisingly, the industry depends upon heavy advertising schedules and massive public relations. The five top distillers in 1966 spent \$154 million on advertising. In addition, the Licensed Beverage Industries, Inc., a trade organization, maintains an extensive program to secure favorable news coverage, speakers, and a respectable public image. It even has a special women's division to promote the use of alcohol among women.

Faced with this barrage of propaganda for social acceptability of alcohol, the addict, or potential addict, hears no voice warning him that alcohol can affect different people in different ways. A health warning ordered printed on each label will serve as an objective guideline upon which he can base his own judgment or spur him on to further inquiries.

On September 17 of this year the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare released a monograph entitled "Alcohol and Alcoholism." This document, along with the others which will surely follow, will add immeasurably to the existing efforts to combat the ravages of alcoholism. The closing paragraph of the preface to the monograph reads as follows:

Successful programs for the treatment, control and prevention of alcoholism will require unprecedented public understanding, public support and public participation.

As President Johnson indicated in his health message to Congress in 1966, there is a crying need to "develop an education program to foster public understanding based on scientific fact."

The bill I am introducing today is designed to contribute to a better public awareness of the health problems involved and to enlist public support for programs of this nature. This bill is not a prohibition measure. All it does is require a health warning label, similar to that now required on cigarette packages, on alcoholic beverages containing more than 24 percent alcohol by volume.

This is a reasonable and necessary approach to the problem. Congress should face up to the acknowledged health hazards caused by alcoholism and promptly take action on this bill.

The bill (S. 2500) to require a health warning on the labels of bottles containing certain alcoholic beverages, introduced by Mr. THURMOND (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice

by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2500

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5(e) of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act (49 Stat. 982, as amended; 27 U.S.C. 205(e)), is amended by inserting the following new paragraph immediately before the last full paragraph of such section:

"It shall be unlawful to sell or ship or deliver for sale or shipment, or otherwise introduce in interstate commerce or foreign commerce, or receive therein, or to remove from customs custody for consumption, any bottle containing a beverage having more than 24 percent of alcohol by volume, unless the label of such bottle contains the following statement: 'Caution: Consumption of alcoholic beverages may be hazardous to your health and may be habit forming.' Such statement shall be located in a conspicuous place on each label, and shall appear in conspicuous and legible type in contrast by typography, layout, or color with other printed matter on the label."

EXTENSION OF DURATION OF COPYRIGHT PROTECTION IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases.

The subcommittee has conducted 17 days of hearings on legislation to provide for the first general revision of the copyright law since 1909. Because of serious difficulties with certain provisions of this legislation, it became apparent during the summer that the Congress could not complete action on this subject during the current session. It, therefore, became necessary to consider what interim copyright legislation would be required pending the enactment of the general revision bill.

During the earlier stages of the revision program, the 87th and 89th Congresses passed legislation extending the term of expiring copyrights. The pending revision bill, S. 597, would increase the term of new works to a term for the life of the author and for 50 years thereafter. It also provides for a substantial extension of the term of subsisting copyrights. Under these circumstances, it has seemed desirable that the terms of expiring copyrights should be temporarily extended so that these copyright owners may enjoy the benefit of any increase in term that may be enacted by the Congress.

The joint resolution which I am introducing today would continue the term of expiring copyrights until December 31, 1968. I have been informed by the Copyright Office that this resolution will affect 57,811 renewal registrations. Included among these copyrights are a number of outstanding musical compositions, such as "Alexander's Ragtime Band", "I Wonder Who's Kissing Her Now", "Down by the Old Mill Stream", "Shine on Harvest Moon", and "By the Light of the Silvery Moon". It is appropriate that this joint resolution should be introduced this week

since "Take Me Out to the Ball Game" is also among the compositions that will enjoy a longer term.

One of the major issues involved in the revision bill is the copyright liability of community antenna television systems. The liability of CATV systems for copyright infringement under the Copyright Act of 1909 is the subject of current litigation. In a case now pending before the Supreme Court, lower courts have held that CATV systems are fully liable for retransmitting copyrighted programs without permission. The pending revision bill, S. 597, would modify this liability to some extent. The Federal Communications Commission, the Department of Justice, and the Copyright Office in their testimony before the subcommittee urged certain limitations on the copyright liability of CATV systems.

The subcommittee has been confronted with a situation in which, before the Congress had an opportunity to complete action on the revision bill, a number of lawsuits for copyright infringement might be filed against CATV systems. This could disrupt the television viewing of millions of our citizens. Therefore, consideration has been given to the necessity of legislation providing for a temporary suspension of judicial remedies for copyright infringement by CATV systems. This legislation would have provided for a moratorium on such lawsuits during the period of this interim copyright legislation, but would have protected the substantive rights of the copyright owners by tolling the statute of limitations, and preserving all causes of action.

Before any such legislation was introduced, all interested parties participated in a series of meetings. As a result of these discussions there has been submitted to the subcommittee certain representations on behalf of the major owners and distributors of television film programs. The representations already received, plus others which are anticipated shortly, cover about 95 percent of the copyrighted programs carried by CATV. These representations provide that, while the parties are negotiating contractual arrangements and discussing appropriate legislative formulas, the copyright owners will refrain from instituting legal action against CATV systems. It is further provided that in the event such negotiations are terminated no infringement suits will be filed for a period of 90 days.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I have been assured that these representations are made in good faith. The subcommittee expects both the copyright owners and the National Community Television Association to observe the commitments which they have voluntarily made. Consequently, under the existing circumstances there does not appear to be a substantial risk of lawsuits, and it would appear that no legislative action on this issue is required at the present time. The subcommittee will continue to observe developments, so that it may be prepared to take appropriate action in the future if this should prove necessary. But, as of now, it would seem that the only interim copyright legislation which must be considered at this ses-

sion is the extension of expiring copyrights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 114) extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS TO S. 2226, THE CATTLE INDUSTRY TRADE CONFERENCE ACT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 2226, to provide for an annual conference between representatives of the beef industry, the Secretary of Agriculture, and representatives of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government to consider problems relating to the export of beef and beef products from the United States and related international trade problems, and for other purposes, the names of the following Senators be added as cosponsors: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

I also ask that the statements of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] relating to the bill be included at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statements are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HATFIELD

Mr. President, I welcome the opportunity to join as a co-sponsor of S. 2226, the cattle industry trade conference bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Alabama (Mr. Sparkman).

Although I was not a member of the Small Business Committee at the time of the hearings in 1965 and 1966, I became a member in time to consider and participate in the report on livestock exports expansion which the Committee filed on June 12—Senate Report 343, 90th Congress Session.

As a member of the Agriculture Committee, I am aware of the fact that sales of beef animals account for fully one-quarter of all farm income. Therefore, any steps that can be taken to assist in the strengthening of domestic and foreign markets for this commodity will have wide benefits to livestock producers and processors across the country.

It is a pleasure for me to associate myself with the other Senators who have offered their support to this measure with these goals in mind.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

Mr. President, on August 3, the Senator from Alabama (Mr. Sparkman) introduced S. 2226, the proposed Cattle Industry Trade Conference Act. On that day I was unavoidably absent. It is my understanding that 25 Senators have since asked to co-sponsor this measure.

As Chairman of the Small Business Committee, I would like to take this opportunity to join as the 26th co-sponsor, and to commend the Senator from Alabama for the leadership which he has provided in this area.

Senator Sparkman was among the first to bring to the attention of the Senate and the

American public, the potential abroad for the sale of U.S. quality meat products and the significance to small and independent livestock producers, finishers and processors, as well as the nation's balance of payments. The investigation of these possibilities spanned nearly three years and three sets of hearings before our Small Business Committee.

As a result, we have learned from the officials of the European Economic Community of a potential market which will have to be serviced by imports and which may reach a billion dollars a year by 1970. Moreover, the EEC constitutes less than half of the 380 million consumers in Western Europe.

It would seem eminently sensible for our meat industries in this country to examine these trade prospects on a regular and continuing basis, and this is what S. 2226 seeks to bring about.

For these reasons I am glad to support this legislation and to recognize the initiative and the accomplishments of the Senator from Alabama in this matter.

CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE FRENCH REPUBLIC, RELATING TO TAXES ON INCOME—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive N, 90th Congress, first session, a convention between the United States of America and the French Republic with respect to taxes on income, signed at Paris on July 28, 1967, transmitted today by the President of the United States and that the convention, together with the message from the President, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the convention between the United States of America and the French Republic with respect to taxes on income, signed at Paris on July 28, 1967.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Acting Secretary of State with respect to the convention and the copy, enclosed therewith, of a note addressed on July 28, 1967, by the American Ambassador in Paris to the Secretary General of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Upon entry into force, the existing income tax convention of July 25, 1939, between the United States and France would be abrogated in its entirety and the double taxation convention of October 18, 1946, the supplementary protocol of May 17, 1948, and the supplementary convention of June 22, 1956, would be superseded insofar as they concern taxes on income, capital, and stock exchange transactions.

Fundamental changes in the French income tax structure were made in 1965. The new convention reflects those changes and also changes made in U.S.

law by the Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1966. Certain aspects of the model convention on taxation of income and capital published in 1963 by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—OECD—resulting from the trend toward standardizing international tax relationships, are also reflected in the new convention with France.

The new convention follows the patterns set by the income tax conventions with Germany, the United Kingdom, and the Netherlands as recently amended.

Among the articles of special interest are those which provide: (a) that dividends received by a U.S. corporation from a French affiliate will be subject to tax at a 5-percent rate instead of the 15-percent rate applicable under the existing convention; (b) that interest income will be subject to tax at a 10-percent tax rate in most cases instead of the 15-percent rate applicable under the existing convention; (c) that royalties, instead of being exempt from tax in the source country, will be subject to a 5-percent tax; (d) for changes in the definition of industrial and commercial profits to include motion picture film rentals; and (e) that France waives its tax on imputed income based on the rental value of property in certain cases where a U.S. resident owns property in France.

The convention has the approval of the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to this convention with France.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 3, 1967.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 3, 1967, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 602. An act to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

S.J. Res. 109. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation commemorating 50 years of service to the Nation by the Langley Research Center.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HAYDEN ON HIS 90TH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I regret very much that I could not be on the floor of the Senate yesterday to pay tribute and to offer congratulations to our distinguished and beloved President pro tempore on the occasion of his 90th birthday anniversary. I was in Alabama attending a seminar sponsored by the Small Business Administration. I trust that the senior Senator from Arizona will know that my remarks today are no less sincere by reason of their being offered a day late.

I have known CARL HAYDEN since I first came to Congress as a Member of the House in 1936. At that time, Senator

HAYDEN had been a Member of the Senate for 10 years, having been elected in 1926, after serving 15 years in the House of Representatives.

CARL HAYDEN is one of the most colorful Members of Congress. He was twice elected sheriff of Maricopa County—in 1906 and 1908. At that time, Arizona was a Territory, and the West was pretty wild. The sheriff was the law in those days, and it took a man of great courage and ability to fill the job. CARL HAYDEN was such a man. Following his service as sheriff, and upon the admission of Arizona as a State, he was elected as his State's first Representative in Congress.

As his years of service to Arizona and to America rolled by CARL HAYDEN built a remarkable reputation for ability and integrity. These two qualities, in combination with his seniority, have brought many honors to Senator HAYDEN. He serves as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and is a member of both the Committee on Rules and Administration and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He also serves as chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing.

The remarkable thing about CARL HAYDEN is that with all of the power and influence which is his to command, and with all the honors which have come his way, he remains a kind and considerate friend, always sensitive to the needs and feelings of others.

It is a great privilege for me to pay tribute to this great Senator and great American, and to wish him a happy birthday.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am delighted to learn that yesterday was the 90th birthday anniversary of the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the President pro tempore of the Senate. This is a rare benchmark for any of us to reach, particularly when leading the strenuous and tension-ridden life of Congress, and I congratulate Senator HAYDEN on achieving it.

More to the point, I congratulate his State of Arizona on having such a fine, powerful, and intelligent spokesman in Congress.

In that my father and Senator HAYDEN served together and were friends in the House of Representatives, I add a personal word of good wishes, and also a word of thanks to a senior colleague who has always been as kind and thoughtful as has Senator HAYDEN to me.

NO INFLATION IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, much has been published in the newspapers recently about the danger of inflation and of advancing food prices. As a Senator from an agricultural State, where prices received for farm commodities have been falling, I find it quite difficult to understand.

Farm prices are indefensibly low, compared with farm costs. They are lower than they were 20 years ago. I have just examined the September issue of Economic Indicators, published by the Joint Economic Committee. It shows that the wholesale price index for farm commodities was 8.7 points down from August a

year ago, and stood at 99.4 in August of this year. The wholesale price index on processed foods was off 3.6 points between August 1966 and August this year.

There is no sudden spurt in the economy and purchasing power to indicate inflation. Economic Indicators shows that we experienced a slight decline in gross national product in the first quarter this year, based on a stable price level, and that our economic growth rate in the first half of the year was only about 2.5 percent—far less than we require to maintain stable employment and a stable economy.

In the absence of any sign in economic statistics to justify inflation warnings one must conclude that if prices, and especially food prices, are advanced now it will be as a consequence of handlers increasing their markups to keep their profits stable in face of a decline in volume sold, rather than a consequence of burgeoning gross national product and purchasing power.

I certainly hope, Mr. President, that no one will have the audacity to blame rising farm prices for any increases which may be made in retail food costs, although I shall not be surprised if it happens. In the past, small increases in farm prices have been used as an excuse for much larger increases in retail food prices. But it is going to be difficult to blame farmers for any advances in food prices now when farm prices are indistinguishably low and still falling. The parity index just issued shows that prices received by farmers on September 15 were 73 percent of parity—down 7 percent from September 15 a year ago and 2 percent from August 15 this year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an article by William H. Kester, financial editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, on the paradox of lower wholesale and basic commodity price levels, and talk of inflation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFLATIONARY INFLUENCES MOUNT DESPITE DROP IN PRICE INDEXES
(By William H. Kester)

Expectations of inflation are widespread, although wholesale price indexes have declined in the last 12 months.

The recent boom in stock prices has been attributed to investors' beliefs that further increases in the general price level are inevitable, especially in view of the reluctance of Congress to increase taxes.

Many economists inside and outside the Administration have warned of incipient inflation in recent weeks.

WHOLESALE INDEX DECLINES

But the Government's wholesale price index in August was 106.1 per cent of the 1957-59 average, compared with the record high of 106.8 reached in August and September last year.

In addition, the Government's index of basic raw material prices has dropped about 10 per cent in the last 12 months and is more than 15 per cent below the 1966 peak. The decline has been widespread, with raw industrial commodity prices off 20 per cent from the March 1966 peak and foodstuffs showing a 14 per cent decline since reaching a peak in August 1966.

The decline in the last 12 months of the over-all wholesale price index resulted from a decline in prices of farm products and

processed foods that more than offset higher prices of industrial commodities.

Prices of industrial commodities were stable from last February to July after a two-year period of increases that added 4 per cent to the index. In August, the rise was resumed and recently announced price increases have apparently pushed the index to new highs.

The price level of farm products has declined this year due in large part to expectations of record harvests and increased supplies.

CONSUMER PRICE INDEX HIGHER

Inflationary trends are evident in the consumer price index—which increased at a 4 per cent annual rate from April to July, after rising at a 2 per cent rate during the previous seven months, the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis reported. The index, which is not adjusted for seasonal variations, in July was 2.8 per cent higher than it was a year earlier.

The bank noted that the acceleration in the index was due primarily to food prices. These vary seasonally.

There has been no acceleration in the rise of consumer prices other than food, the bank reported. It said these prices increased at a 3 per cent annual rate from April to July, virtually the same rate as in the previous seven months.

WAGE SPIRAL ACCELERATES

Many recent price increases have been made to cover higher wage costs. Collective bargain settlements in the first half of 1967 involved wage and fringe benefit increases averaging 4.6 per cent a year, compared with increases of 4.1 per cent in all of 1966 and 3.3 per cent in 1965.

Not only have wage costs increased at a faster pace this year than in other recent years, but productivity gains have been limited by the decline in manufacturing output in the early part of 1967.

"The combination of rising labor costs and virtual stability in output per man-hour resulted in a sharp increase in labor costs per unit of output," the Federal Reserve Bank of New York said in its latest monthly review.

The Government's index of labor cost for each unit of manufacturing output in July was 106.7 per cent of the 1957-59 average, compared with 100.8 a year earlier. From 1959 to 1966 it was about steady.

Inflationary pressures will be reduced but not eliminated as manufacturing output expands. The bank said "while productivity can reasonably be expected to move upward once again as the economy expands more vigorously, it is unlikely that the growth in output per man-hour will be adequate to offset mounting labor costs."

DEMAND PUSH NOTED

Another source of recent inflationary pressures has been the increase in demand, the New York Reserve Bank said. As sales went up, producers have been encouraged to hike prices to cover rising costs and to recover profit margins.

Profits of corporations have declined this year despite rising sales for most. In the first half of this year, the ratio of profits to income originating in corporations was 12 per cent, compared with a peak of 13.5 per cent in the first quarter of 1966.

Much of the consumer price index—which is widely used as a measure of inflation—is based on consumer services, in which improvements in labor productivity are small. As a result, the consumer price index has an upward trend.

Wages in the consumer service industries continue to rise along with those in other industries, where labor is more highly unionized and labor productivity increases are larger. But the small improvements in labor productivity in the consumer service industries do not offset the increased labor costs, and prices are hiked to cover the wage increases.

SENATORS BIBLE AND CANNON HAIL ACCEPTANCE OF F-111

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the formal acceptance of the F-111 by the Tactical Air Command on September 23, 1967, at Nellis Air Force Base ranks with other significant milestones in the annals of aviation. It is a natural step ahead in the tradition of the Wright brothers' initial flight and the XF-1's breaking of the sound barrier by Chuck Yeager.

We now have a swing-wing airplane in the Air Force inventory capable of assuming any mode, flying high or low, fast or slow, and carrying weights unheard of in the history of tactical aviation. Like all aircraft, it has had its growing pains, but recent reports are most encouraging.

Although still in the category III testing stage, the present F-111 aircraft at Nellis are averaging 60 hours a month, an unprecedented accomplishment for a new weapons system, I am told. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the commemorative remarks made on September 23 by the commander of the Tactical Air Command and by the senior and junior Senators from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE and Mr. CANNON] during the dedication ceremony at Nellis Air Force Base.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY GEN. G. P. DISOSWAY, COMMANDER, TACTICAL AIR COMMAND, NELLIS AFB, NEV., SEPTEMBER 23, 1967

I'm delighted to be out here today for the ceremony bringing the F-111A into the tactical inventory. We always have a lot of problems with airplanes until we get them out in the field and then the people in the field seem to cure it. As an example of this, since we've had these airplanes out here we've been flying them about 60 hours a month each. This is unprecedented with a new aircraft. No matter what you read in the newspapers it does fly and that's why we flew it today so all of you could witness it in flight.

We've got great hopes for the airplane. We've got lots of things to do with it because it's in the Category III testing. At the same time we're doing that, we're going to have to upgrade our instructor pilots so that they can carry on the training of the other people who will come in as we get more aircraft in the inventory.

As you know, not only the Combat Crew Training but also the first wing is going to be here at Nellis. So we've got lots of work to do. We've got lots of testing to do in the various modes that this aircraft is capable of.

It's certainly the most advanced aircraft right now, I suspect, in the world, although the Russians, I understand, had a swing-wing at a show they had over in Moscow. I haven't asked Mr. Cosby to analyze that to see if they've stolen any of his ideas on the General Dynamics swing-wing airplane.

So, all in all, we're very happy to have it. We've got it where it belongs—with the people who're going to fly it and fight it. We're going to make a good weapons system out of it.

REMARKS OF SENATOR ALAN BIBLE, AT THE FORMAL ACCEPTANCE OF THE F-111 BY THE AIR TACTICAL COMMAND, NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE, LAS VEGAS, NEV., SEPTEMBER 23, 1967

After seeing the F-111 in action, I want to say first of all that I'm glad it's on our side.

It would be a gross understatement to describe it merely as an impressive aircraft.

Based on today's demonstration, I think all of us agree it will prove a powerful addition to the air arm of our nation's defense posture.

Now that it's airborne, I for one hope the controversy which has shadowed the F-111 stage will finally subside. This pioneer aircraft should be judged purely on its merits.

I realize problems still exist in the development of the Navy version, but from what I have heard and just seen the F-111A performs very well indeed for the Air Force. Pilots have referred to it as the "Cadillac of the Air" and "the greatest thing with wings since angels."

Pilots also agree it is a remarkably versatile aircraft which lives up to its billing as a complete airborne weapons system. It flies high and low, fast and slow, throws a power punch greater than five World War II heavy bombers and is able to sniff out targets with unerring accuracy.

It sounds as if I have a great deal of respect for the judgment of our Air Force pilots. I do, because I have always had a sneaking suspicion that pilots know more about flying airplanes than anyone else. And I think it's significant that a good deal of the criticism of the F-111 has come from people who aren't pilots.

I take a great deal of interest in the affairs of Nellis Air Force Base. I am proud of the important role it plays in our effort to win the war in Vietnam as well as its role in our other defense obligations.

Assignment of the F-111 to the Air Tactical Command has meant a tremendous increase in personnel and physical facilities here at Nellis. I am happy that my position as Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Sub-Committee on Military Construction has made it possible for me to insure that the needs of this important installation are met. I intend to see that these needs continue to be met in the future, because I view the mission of the United States Air Force as vital to the defense of this nation.

This week, Nellis takes part in observances marking the 20th anniversary of the Air Force. Nothing so graphically illustrates the tremendous progress of this arm of the service than the flight of the F-111 here today. It is a remarkable plane; one which looks capable of carrying on its own private war.

But if the F-111 is a challenging aircraft, certainly its application as the number one Air Force weapon and the training of the men who will fly it is a challenge of equal magnitude.

It deserves the best possible care. And it will be guaranteed the best, because it is in the hands of the officers and men of Nellis Air Force Base. I am happy you have been chosen by your government for this important responsibility.

REMARKS OF SENATOR HOWARD W. CANNON, AT NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE OPEN HOUSE FOR F-111

Distinguished guests, I am honored by this opportunity to participate in welcoming the F-111 to Nellis Air Force Base.

I am told that the fighter-jockeys here could not wait and have already logged more than 500 hours in this great airplane. Now that I have talked with them and seen for myself, I can understand their tremendous enthusiasm.

We are delighted that Nellis has been chosen as the F-111's "home." The plane has been to the jungles of Panama and the frozen wastes of Alaska; it has traveled overseas as far as the United Kingdom and France; it has been tested at facilities across the country from California to New York. I am sure I speak for all of us in saying, "welcome to Nevada."

Over the years, we have welcomed a proud procession of tactical aircraft through Nellis—the F-86 Sabrejet, the F-100 Super-sabre, the F-105 Thunderchief, the F-4 Phantom. But the F-111 is much more than just

a worthy successor. It opens a new era in the effectiveness, versatility and striking power of our tactical forces. It is fitting that it has arrived at a time when the Air Force is celebrating its 20th birthday.

It is fitting on this occasion to pay tribute to some of the men responsible for this bold breakthrough, men like General Frank Everest, the TAC commander who was one of the first to grasp the untapped military potential of the variable sweep wing. To him goes much of the credit for assuring that tactical aviation would remain in the technological forefront. Even now the principle of this wing is being proposed for the advanced manned strategic bomber, the supersonic transport, and next generation fighters such as the FX and VFAX. TAC has led the way with the F-111.

Another is General Walter C. Sweeney, the TAC commander who was a driving force behind the F-111 until his untimely passing. I recall his remarks in 1964, when the first F-111 rolled out of the factory at Fort Worth. He said:

"The F-111 represents far more than just a new aircraft with greater flexibility to us. It represents a major break-through in tactical air capabilities."

"Many planes have come close. But there was always a compromise."

"The F-111 with its revolutionary variable-geometry wing will give us a combination of tactical air capabilities far beyond those we have been able to achieve up to now in any single aircraft."

General Disosway, General Taylor, and men of the USAF Tactical Weapons Center, we are proud to be here with you today to celebrate the payoff—the formal acceptance of the F-111 into the TAC inventory. The military development agencies and the nationwide industrial team led by General Dynamics Corporation have worked hard for almost five years with only one thought in mind—to deliver to you the finest tactical weapon system that has ever been built. I know you join me in acknowledging the great debt that is owed them.

In the F-111 you have the revolutionary new aircraft that General Everest was told might never work. In the F-111 you have the tactical system without compromises that General Sweeney envisioned. Their hopes are now your hardware. Yours is the high honor of being the first to cross one of the most significant thresholds in the history of tactical airpower.

Aircraft have been spanning the Atlantic unrefueled for years, but not tactical aircraft. Strategic bombers have long routinely carried payloads in the five figures, but not tactical aircraft. As tactical aircraft have improved in speed and range, moreover, there have usually been attendant drawbacks in deployment flexibility. Runways have had to be lengthened and reinforced reliability and maintainability have become more complex, and requirements for support equipment have increased.

For the first time, in the F-111, you have an aircraft that combines these capabilities into a single, multi-potent package—one that excels at both supersonic and subsonic speeds, simply by moving its wings—one that can operate from short, unprepared fields, yet carries payloads that blur the distinction between tactical and strategic aircraft—one that can deploy anywhere in the world without tanker support, but is also highly reliable, easy to maintain, and needs only a minimum of facilities.

In the F-111, you have a tactical weapon system with all-weather precision bombing accuracies and defense penetration capabilities superior to those of any other aircraft in the USAF inventory. You have an aircraft that will multiply several-fold the effective combat durations and distances available to the tactical commander, whether the mission is close-support with the F-111's inter-

nal gun or long-range strikes with the full spectrum of conventional and nuclear weapons. You have an aircraft so advanced, militarily and technologically, that other countries have been left far behind and are now seeking to catch up.

Now it is up to you. From your ranks will come the pilots and ground crews who will weld these capabilities into combat ready units. You will be the ones who rewrite the book on tactical doctrines with this extraordinary aircraft. In the process, I am sure you will be setting new records, adding to the long list the F-111 has already compiled. More important, you will be gaining the training and experience necessary to assure that your "birds" are there whenever and wherever tactical airpower is needed. I am confident that the F-111 fighting units you will form here and command will be second to none in the world today.

We in Nevada are proud to share in this endeavor. That Nellis has been selected for the F-111 speaks well for the Las Vegas climate and the excellent community relationships that have been built up over the years. An important part of the success of the training at Nellis is the support that we have given and will continue to give its personnel and programs.

I am proud to have been a part of the development and growth here at Nellis for a period predating my service in the Senate. Proud because this base has for many years placed our State in the forefront of the Nation's defense. And now—thanks to the F-111—that contribution will continue and be enlarged.

Thank you.

"THE SICKNESS OF ANACHRONISM" AND "THE AMERICAN PROMISE"

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, two extremely perceptive articles of great pertinence and of enduring worth appear as full-page editorials in successive issues of Newsweek. In the issue of October 2, Emmet John Hughes writes on "The Sickness of Anachronism." He points out that while the world moves, our foreign policy does not. It is rigid, ossified, obsolete. He points out that our actions in world affairs are dated by treaties entered into in past decades under conditions which are no longer applicable.

Walter Lippmann, in the October 9 issue, writes on "The American Promise" and points to the great distrust that now exists in the world of our foreign policy which is "accentuated by the spectacular ineffectiveness" of the administration's "resort to military force" and that "as against the military muddle in Vietnam there is, by way of contrast, the tremendous example of the American way of life."

Both of these editorials, written by two extremely knowledgeable and lucid writers, deserve wide reading. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SICKNESS OF ANACHRONISM (By Emmet John Hughes)

"If I were Secretary of State," a veteran of twenty years of Washington politics told me last week, "I would urgently start measuring how far the world has traveled these last two decades—and how far American policy has lagged behind. I would restudy all the premises of the 1940s and all the stale official definitions of 'aggressive world Communism.'

And I would review all commitments around the globe—to sift out the worthless and the reckless."

Such an assessment would seem not at all remarkable from an Administration critic like Sen. William Fulbright. But the critic voicing this distress stands among Lyndon Johnson's closest counselors. And such nagging unease even within this privileged circle sharply suggests the whole Capital's growing awareness that national policy betrays again a familiar American weakness: the habit of clocking history by the minute hand of a sluggish timepiece, while the rest of the world races ahead by its own calendar of the years.

The sense of this seems quickened this season by the simultaneous celebration of different but related birthdays. In Washington, the Central Intelligence Agency—a kind of American monument to the East-West conflict—has just celebrated its twentieth anniversary, with the President hailing its performance as "the best in the world." In New York, the U.N. General Assembly has celebrated its 22nd session by electing as its President the Rumanian Foreign Minister—the first Communist to be so honored. And in San Francisco, Defense Secretary Robert McNamara celebrated "the 22nd Year of the Atomic Age" by outlining a \$5 billion defense screen against Chinese missiles, while plaintively appealing: "What the world requires . . . is a new race toward reasonableness."

The appeal sounds unassailable. But to many American ears, it rings hollow. For there are few voices in the land to proclaim confidently the current *reasonableness* of American policy.

The doubt hinges critically on the question of historic time. The basic U.S. commitments embrace no less than 42 countries; some U.S. military presence appears in 38 countries; and some kind of U.S. aid travels to 76 countries. These commitments find roots in a diplomacy aged exactly twenty years: the Inter-American Treaty (1947), NATO (1949), and SEATO (1954). Yet the quickest glimpse of the world of twenty years ago—this very month—suggests an almost alien world . . . In the Middle East, the British Palestine police were haplessly fighting off Jewish guerrillas sworn to make an Israel yet unborn . . . In the Far East, the Chiang Kai-shek government was shooting its own generals to stamp out corruption in Manchuria . . . In Rumania, there was heard no soft-spoken leader aspiring to preside over the United Nations, but the strident Ana Pauker lashing all Americans as "Fascists."

The insistent doubt rises: could policies apt for *then* also be fit for *now*? Yet the basic American designs seem amended scarcely at all . . . In Europe, a U.S. force of more than 350,000 men still stands watch against the most unlikely of events—a massive Soviet drive to the Atlantic. Why? . . . In Asia, a U.S. force of nearly 700,000, from Vietnam to Korea, is deployed to impose a political settlement by containing a China bloodily divided against itself and politically quarantined by America. How? . . . And in Washington, all the world of the late 1960s seems addressed with precisely the rhetoric—and the righteousness—that were the political fashion of the early 1950s. On almost any occasion, the latest apologia proclaimed by Dean Rusk could be read as the oldest anathema hurled by John Foster Dulles. Indeed, the official rhetoric insists that the war in Vietnam is the same as the defense of Berlin. Really?

It is this profound lack of discernment that marks the faltering of American leadership. Such as the bloated size of American purpose that its commitments do not merely span the continents; no less indiscriminately, they span the decades. And from this there can follow the worst kind of national policy: random, reactionary and headlong.

Even the concern voiced to me by the

President's friend itself seems belated. For it called to mind a conversation in London—a full ten years ago—with the gifted Sir Ivone Kirkpatrick, then Permanent Under Secretary of the Foreign Office. "If this thing we call 'the West' is to survive," the veteran diplomat warned, "we must decide not only what to save but also what *not* to save. We cannot arm, educate, industrialize and inspire every country on earth. We must judge certain places worth little enough to say to the Communists: 'It's yours. Take it. Spend your rubles, send your technicians, pick your puppets—and waste your time!' We cannot be—or do—all things with all nations. We must fix priorities. We must make choices. What else lies within reason?"

It is this frontier of reason that American policy still seems unable to find and to heed.

THE AMERICAN PROMISE (By Walter Lippmann)

After a summer in Europe, when for the most part I sat back and watched, I am impressed with how much Americans and Europeans are involved in the same predicament. For us all the world is disorderly and dangerous, ungoverned and apparently ungovernable. Everywhere there is great anxiety and bewilderment. This general concern about the threat of atomic war, of revolution and counterrevolution is suffused by almost everybody's preoccupation with the difficult business of living in the modern age.

The governments of the more advanced countries, those which have outgrown the first illusions of liberation and independence, are all of them unpopular governments. For they are failing to cope with disorders abroad and with trouble at home. In the more-developed countries, Communist as well as non-Communist, there are no great sustaining, unifying and inspiring beliefs, no schemes of salvation and no ardent promises of better things to come.

This dusty outlook marks, I believe, the historic fact that we are living through the closing chapters of the established and traditional way of life. We are in the early beginnings of a struggle, which will probably last for generations, to remake our civilization. It is not a good time for politicians. It is a time for prophets and leaders and explorers and inventors and pioneers, and for those who are willing to plant trees for their children to sit under.

The international order which evolved since the Middle Ages, the order imposed and managed by the Western great powers, has been shattered. There are some who think we can return to that old order, with the United States replacing the Great Britain of the nineteenth century. But all who think this, President Johnson and Secretary Rusk and Mr. Nixon for example, merely compound the confusion and anarchy of the international order. It is a naïve illusion that 1967 is 1939, that Southeast Asia is Western Europe, that Mao Tse-tung is Hitler and that Lyndon Johnson is Churchill. It is not producing a firm and free international order but the largest quagmire in which this country has ever floundered.

Unpopularity. The best that can be said for President Johnson is that the other leaders of great powers are also in trouble. The Gallup polls are bad reading in Paris, London, Moscow, New Delhi and Peking. This general unpopularity of the governments of great powers throws light on the problem. But it does not explain away what has happened in Washington. More is expected and more is demanded of the President of the United States than from any other head of government. For the United States is incomparably the most powerful country in the world. Moreover the original purpose of America has created hopes and expectations in the hearts of men everywhere. The original vocation and destiny of the American people has been, not that they should rule the world, but,

that they should provide an example of how men can live in freedom.

The dislike and distrust of Johnson's America is harsh. It stems in the last analysis, I believe, from a feeling of having been let down. There is a growing belief that Johnson's America is no longer the historic America, that it is a bastard empire which relies on superior force to achieve its purposes, and is no longer providing an example of the wisdom and humanity of a free society. There is, to be sure, envy, fear, rivalry in the worldwide anti-Johnsonism. But the inner core of this sentiment is a feeling of betrayal and abandonment. It is a feeling that the American promise has been betrayed and abandoned.

Ineffectiveness. This feeling is accentuated by the spectacular ineffectiveness of President Johnson's resort to military force. After years of struggle the greatest military power on earth finds itself unable to bend to its will a small and backward people. Our hawks ascribe this lack of military success to the official strategy of wounding but not killing the adversary. The performance in Vietnam would be a military scandal were it not a demonstration, which is of enormous historic significance, that the firepower of modern weaponry can annihilate an adversary or neutralize him but it cannot bend him to its will.

As against the military muddle in Vietnam there is, by way of contrast, the tremendous example of the American way of life. An irresistible tide of Americanization is flooding the world with our airplanes and computers and supermarkets, our household appliances, with ready-made clothing, with mechanical entertainment, carrying along with it what is convenient and pleasant in our lives and also much of our vulgarity.

The fact of our example is greater than the force of our arms. If only we realized this, if only we were governed by men who realized that the age of Roosevelt and Churchill is over, we might begin to pull ourselves out of the quagmire.

OPPOSITION TO FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN BILL

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, almost daily I encounter evidence of widespread opposition to the Federal Election Campaign bill that is scheduled to be reported this week by the Committee on Finance.

I have not been surprised. I cannot imagine that the American people would countenance opening the U.S. Treasury in order to pay for the election of campaign of politicians. This proposal is especially repugnant at a time when we cannot balance the budget, when we face a deficit of almost \$30 billion, and when the President wants more taxes. But in my view, it would be repugnant to the American people at any time.

I invite the attention of the Senate to three editorials published in Georgia newspapers recently which express opposition to this proposal in no uncertain terms. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Savannah Morning News, Sept. 27, 1967]

DEFEAT CAMPAIGN SUBSIDY

Georgia's Sen. Herman Talmadge is congratulated for his stand against the public subsidy of presidential and senatorial election campaigning.

Sen. Talmadge last week urged the defeat

of a bill which would provide some \$28 million of public funds for the presidential and vice-presidential campaigns and \$26 million for Senate nominees.

Talmadge, and we, call the bill "unthinkable."

In the first place, even if financing politicians of opposing political parties were an advisable undertaking, now is not the time to do it. In the second place, there is no good time to do it.

"At a time when we cannot balance the budget—when the President is requesting additional taxes of \$8 billion to saddle another burden on the taxpayers of this country to say you must finance politicians, you must turn the keys of the Treasury over to politicians is "unthinkable," Talmadge said.

An obvious disadvantage of such a bill is that it is similar to arming both sides in a military conflict—merely an expensive way to waste ammunition from both sides of the public trough.

Furthermore, when the President has been in office more than four years, the voters already know what he has to offer. They do not need to waste \$28 million to hear more of his promises. They might, in fact, be willing to spend twice that to support an opponent able to unseat him.

In that case, the equal slice of public funds would only serve to perpetuate an unpopular and unwanted regime in power.

If the people wish to support the campaign of their favorite Senate or presidential candidate, they are free to do this privately—and selectively—without the "unthinkable" necessity to raise taxes to subsidize both sides of a political propaganda war.

The campaign financing bill should be defeated.

[From the Augusta Herald, Sept. 27, 1967]

THE PERSISTENT RAIDERS

Political "ins" who almost had a financial bonanza, in the form of a federal presidential campaign subsidy, within their grasp, only to have it snatched away by a Congress that finally had come to its senses, do not give up a good thing easily.

Last year, a proposal by Sen. Russell Long (D-La.) to permit taxpayers to check off, in their income tax returns, a \$1 contribution to a presidential campaign fund, slipped through Congress with very little fanfare. After some second thoughts, the present session of Congress voted to suspend the operation of the law, which it was estimated would pour \$30 million apiece into the war chests of the two major parties. That, supposedly, was an end to the plunderers' raiding ambitions.

But the tenacity of those who sense a windfall is not to be discounted. This same subsidy proposition, in somewhat altered form, has popped up once again. The Senate Finance Committee, dominated by the same Sen. Russell Long, has reported out a modified version of Long's original "check off" plan which would permit taxpayers to subtract up to \$25 from their annual tax bill for contributions to political candidates at any level. The bill would make available an estimated \$54 million—\$14 million to each of the two major party candidates for President and \$26 million to the candidates in 34 Senate contests—all of it in federal funds.

There is a big catch, however. The money isn't there, and won't be there next year. Sen. John L. Williams (R-Del.), one of the leaders in the fight to repeal the original Long bill, has called pointed attention to the fact that upcoming revenues are already more than spoken for and that creation of this political slush fund would only make worse the overspending binge on which the current Administration has embarked.

"At a time when the federal deficit is \$25 to \$30 billion and we're talking about increasing taxes," he said, "it's unbelievable

that Congress and the Administration would ask their grandchildren to finance the 1968 election. The money isn't in the Treasury."

Actually, cost of the proposed subsidy could be much more—well over \$100 million. What the cost might be if House members also decide to hop aboard the gravy train is anybody's guess. This they can do if they choose; the campaign contribution proposal was tacked on as an amendment to a House-passed bill to establish a working capital fund for the Department of the Treasury, and in this amended form would be subject to further House approval—and further amendment.

The subsidy bill, patently a financing hedge by a party that has found itself dismally on the decline in popularity—not to mention, undercut financially—has generated strong opposition from the Republicans as well as from a number of Democrats. Among the latter are Sen. Herman Talmadge of Georgia, lone Democratic dissenter on the Finance Committee, and Sen. Frank Lausche of Ohio, who has called the proposal "unjust, wicked . . . an insult to the intelligence of every taxpayer in the United States."

And that it is. We have seen, in our times, the Treasury raided under any number of half-baked pretexts. Now, to throw the coffers—and empty coffers, at that—open to politicians whose chief concern seems to be no better than that of self-perpetuation in office, would be the ultimate in the public's surrender of its political birthright.

[From the Dublin Courier-Herald, Sept. 25, 1967]

NO TAXES FOR POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

The suggestion of using tax monies for political campaigns is about the worst idea of the use of tax monies we can think of. By no stretch of the imagination can we see that tax monies should be spent in campaigns for political office.

And there are reasons.

In the first place, the American public is saddled with enough things for which tax monies are spent, things that range from trying to educate and train people who don't want to be educated and trained to paying for high-priced bombs that are dropped on the trees in the jungles of Vietnam.

In the second place, we shudder to think that money we pay in taxes will be used to promote the campaign of a man we don't want elected to office. We can think of nothing that would be less palatable to us than using tax money we pay to promote the campaign of the present President for reelection.

In the third place, it seems to be a dangerous precedent for taxpayers to pay campaign expenses on the national level, to be brought then down to the state level for U.S. Senators, and then certain to be brought to the district level for U.S. Representatives. It would then be only a short step for agitation to pay political expenses of state and local candidates. Somehow, we think the taxpayers of the nation have enough on their shoulders paying for the operations of the government. Paying for people to get places in the government seems a burden too great to bear.

FEASIBILITY OF THE METRIC SYSTEM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President as another session of Congress moves into its final weeks, the Nation may once again be losing its change to ascertain the benefits to our economy of switching to the metric system of weights and measures.

There are many who feel already that such a change would bring with it large economic benefits through increased ef-

ficiency at home and increased sales abroad.

The grocery industry, in its trade magazine, *Grocery Manufacturer*, has spoken strongly in favor of legislation which Representative GEORGE P. MILLER and I have introduced to study the feasibility of a switch to the metric system.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent article, entitled "Grams for Groceries?" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAMS FOR GROCERIES?

Only U.S. of all major nations clings to use of pounds as basic measurement, so two bills before Congress propose three-year study of problems in conversion to metric system.

Nine out of ten people in the world use kilograms and meters as measures of weight and length, and before long the United States will be the only major nation which still measures in pounds and yards. The trend is strongly toward worldwide adoption of the metric system.

The metric system has been legal in the United States for 101 years. While its adoption has grown and some industries have converted completely to its use, grocery manufacturing in this country has barely been touched by the metric trend. Only a few packaged food producers list the contents of their packages in grams as well as pounds to use the same containers in foreign as well as domestic distribution.

All of this could change in the not-too-distant future. Legislation for a three-year study of the problems of U.S. conversion to the metric system has twice passed the Senate and has Administration support. This just might be the year for one tentative step toward conforming with the rest of the world.

The key bills are S. 441, by Sen. Claiborne Pell (D., R.I.), and H.R. 3136, by Rep. George P. Miller (D., Calif.). The stumbling block for a metric study has been the House Rules Committee, where the Miller bill has rested for months following approval by a House committee.

Both the Senate and House bills declare: "That the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized to conduct a program of investigation, research, and survey to determine the impact of increasing worldwide use of the metric system in the United States; to appraise the desirability and practicality of increasing the use of metric weights and measures in the United States, and to evaluate the costs and benefits of alternative courses of action which may be feasible for the United States."

The bill calls for "appropriate participation by representatives of United States industry, science, engineering, and labor, and their associations, in the planning and conduct of the program . . . and in the evaluation of the information secured under such program." The study would be completed within three years of enactment of a law. A first-year appropriation of \$500,000 would be authorized. Cost of the study would be about \$2.5 million.

GMA silent. While there are some vocal business proponents and opponents of U.S. adoption of the metric system, the general attitude of American industry has been one of watchful waiting. Some trade associations have committees investigating the problems. Grocery Manufacturers of America has no policy on converting to metrics but is watching the legislative situation.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States has taken no position for or against the metric system but has endorsed the study proposal, providing the legislation retains its present language guaranteeing business rep-

resentation in conducting and evaluating the government study. Some manufacturers are opposed even to a study, fearing it would lead to the change.

It is admitted by everybody that converting to the metric system would be very expensive for U.S. industry. A Stanford University survey estimated this cost at \$11 billion. General Motors considers this figure is far too low and believes the price tag might be \$26 billion. General Electric estimates its own conversion costs at \$200 million.

Nobody really knows the price tag. However, most students of the problem agree that the longer the delay, the higher the cost. Advocates like Senator Pell argue that as much as \$20 billion in foreign sales is being lost annually because the United States clings to an "antediluvian" system of weights and measures.

Not new to some. Without any push from Washington, a number of industries have already switched to metrics in whole or in part, including pharmaceuticals, electronics, chemicals, electric power, photography, optometry and oceanography. The motive in each case has been economic necessity—to get in step with the rest of the world. Some U.S. manufacturers have been using metric measurements for more than 50 years.

In 1965, the Library of Congress made a study for the House Science and Astronautics Committee, which was published as a committee print under the title "Notes on Conversion to the Metric System." The report contained this reference to grocery field:

"Many shoppers have undoubtedly noticed the increasing numbers of packaged grocery items, of food products particularly, which are now showing on their covers the weights in both ounces and grams, the latter generally being in parenthesis following the former. This is probably caused, in part at least, by the needs of their export trade. India, for example, requires that all incoming imports be labeled in metric units."

It is likely that more food manufacturers will soon add metric weights to their labels when they are redesigned to meet the requirements of the new Federal Fair Packaging and Labeling Act.

Advantages. Congressional hearings in recent years have pointed out both the advantages and the disadvantages of U.S. conversion to the metric system. The principal advantage appears to be that foreign trade would be facilitated, since metric nations prefer to deal with those employing the same standards.

There would be an educational by-product if the metric system were adopted here. One advocate claims the metric system can be learned by a schoolchild in one hour. If kilograms, liters and meters replaced pounds and feet, the time it takes to learn mathematics could be cut 25%, it is claimed.

The American Geophysical Union noted that "such monstrosities as proper fractions, denominators, greatest common divisors, and mixed numbers could be laid to rest with the celluloid collar and the oxcart."

Problems. It might take a generation to get the public to accept the new standards. Japan took 38 years to make the change and even then achieved only 85% compliance. England plans a 10-year conversion period.

Business would be forced to maintain double inventories during the conversion period, of products, parts used in manufacturing and maintenance, and specifications. These problems would undoubtedly be more serious in certain other industries, such as automobiles, appliances, and machine tools, than in grocery manufacturing.

Federal and state and local governments would face huge problems. Highway signs would have to substitute kilometers for miles, a zillion purchase specifications would have to be converted and land titles would have to be reissued, just to name a few.

A few inroads. Generally speaking, the

United States now follows what is known as the English system of weights and measures, featuring inches and ounces, feet and pounds. However, the U.S. system already embodies some key parts of the metric system. The unit of time, the second, is a basic unit in the modern metric system. Electrical quantities are measured in watts, a metric unit.

The power input to an electric motor is stated in terms of metric units, but the power output of the same motor is stated in horsepower, which is outside the metric system. In our space program, the problems of conversion became so great that a major part of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has converted entirely to metric measurements.

For many years, the U.S. Navy has measured its gun barrels in millimeters. And of course all physicians write their prescriptions in terms of metric units. Scientific texts are written almost entirely in metric terms, although most engineering books use feet and pounds.

So what we have now is a hodge-podge. In temperature measurement, we have a dual system, centigrade and Fahrenheit. We have short tons and long tons, statute miles and nautical miles, and avoirdupois, troy and apothecaries' measures of weight. We have gallons and British Imperial gallons. Our track sprinters sometimes run the 100-yard dash, and sometimes the 100-meter.

POSSIBILITIES

Would the metric system be an improvement? The rest of the world, including England, which originated our system, thinks so. The U.S. scientific community thinks so. The official spokesman for business in government, the Department of Commerce, thinks so. And for these reasons, Congress may authorize a study. If there is a study, the alternative courses to be considered are:

1. General adoption of the metric system by legislation.
2. Voluntary extension of metric usage, industry by industry.
3. Regulated partial conversion, segment by segment, in identified areas, over an extended period.
4. Solutions other than adoption of the metric system, to mitigate crucial problems.
5. A system of financial incentives to encourage voluntary conversion.

It may be a while yet before Cousin Minnie drives seven kilometers to the nearest super market to buy three liters of milk, a four-kilogram box of breakfast food, and 500 cubic centimeters of cooking oil. But that day may come and it is high time the grocery industry began thinking about the problems that would bring.

WORKSHOP ON GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS AND PROCUREMENT: REMARKS OF SENATOR MORSE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on September 27, 1967, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] addressed a workshop on Government Contracts and Procurement in Eugene, Ore. The workshop was arranged with the cooperation of the Oregon congressional delegation and the Senate Small Business Committee.

His remarks emphasized the role of Pacific Northwest industry in helping to solve the problems of the Federal, State, and local governments, while at the same time strengthening the Nation's maritime programs.

The areas of fisheries, oceanography, and marine science and technology, on which the Senator commented are of great and increasing importance. They affect the health of our domestic business community, our capabilities to as-

sist our allies and friends abroad and thus the conduct of our foreign policy.

These points have been underscored by the outstanding work of my colleague, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], who for many years has been a leader in the quest for forward looking marine legislation. This year he has brought to public attention a body of scholarly material on the potential benefits of developing ocean and fishery resources.

At the Pacific Northwest regional hearings on export expansion conducted by the Senator from Oregon at Portland in May of this year, Senator BARTLETT summarized these thoughts in the form of testimony which would be available to the Small Business Committee as a basis for its action in these areas.

Most recently, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Maritime Affairs of the Senate Commerce Committee, my Alaskan colleague conducted hearings on a number of bills to strengthen the fishery industry of the United States.

I commend Senator MORSE and Senator BARTLETT for their good work, which has a direct impact on Alaska and our other maritime States and territories. I ask unanimous consent that Senator MORSE's recent remarks be printed in the RECORD, so that his observations may be more readily available to all who seek to harness our sea resources.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE AT THE WORKSHOP ON GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS AND PROCUREMENT, EUGENE, OREG., SEPTEMBER 27, 1967

Chancellor Lieuallen, Chairman Sturgen, and Members of the Oregon Business Community, it is a pleasure to be able to be with you for this workshop.

I would like to make some brief observations about the procurement picture, as I see it. Then, in order to cover the subjects of greatest interest, I want to take your questions, for as long as time permits. As you realize, that turns the tables on me, because during my previous assignments in Eugene, it was my job to ask the questions. You might have noticed that I wasn't bold enough to say I could answer all of your questions. But I will try my best.

This conference is only the second that has been held in Oregon devoted to procurement. However, the breadth and depth of the program, and the careful preparation that preceded it will, I feel, make it a significant event.

OREGON INDUSTRY CAN HELP FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

In addition to the size of this attendance, another element which is noteworthy is the nature of the group that we have here. Some of you are experienced in selling to the government; others are just beginning to learn the procedures. However, one thing you possess in common is a range of impressive resources and experience in solving the problems of business.

These qualities hold a potential for the solution of the problems of the federal, state, and local governments that is exciting to contemplate.

I have been asked whether this is a "small business" conference. I suppose that it could be called that, in the sense that small firms account for nearly 50% of Oregon's government sales and that all but a few of Oregon's firms are in that category. Nationwide, 90% of our 290,000 manufacturing companies and

even a greater percentage of food producing, general distribution, and service concerns are small, independent, or closely held companies.

CONFERENCE IS BROADLY REPRESENTATIVE

However, our workshop is not limited to small business. Among the more than 330 registrants, and panelists and briefing officers, the conference, of course, has welcomed the larger corporations. I feel I speak for all of us when I say that we are very pleased to have their executive with us.

We are interested in what these companies have to offer.

Beyond this, however, our sponsors include the business associations such as the Chambers of Commerce, which are the backbone of community business activity. We have research groups; and many State and Federal Government agencies. The great universities of this State are well represented.

Gatherings of this kind probably do not take place very often. It is thus my feeling that the whole may be a little greater than the sum of its parts—not only from the point of view of the goods and services and ideas which are available, but in the momentum which this gathering—coming from across the broad spectrum of business of our State—can develop in many areas.

While I am speaking of distinction, it should be obvious to all who are participating in this conference that many of the most highly qualified contract and procurement specialists in the United States are sitting with us and have been placed at our disposal for these two days. I have been looking forward to meeting as many of them as possible, as you have been doing. I know that their advice and counsel are invaluable and will serve our State and businessmen well. And, they have brought their shopping lists, as I understand it, for \$50 to \$100 million in contracts which will be awarded in the next 30 to 90 days.

As the conference announcement stated, the federal government, and the combined state and local governments both brought about \$77 billion worth of goods and services during 1966. As customers, they each account for between 9 and 10% of total gross national product, so we can only benefit from getting better acquainted.

HISTORY OF PARTICIPATION IN PROCUREMENT HAS BEEN IN TERMS OF PRIME CONTRACTS

For a long time the framework of the procurement picture here in Oregon has been composed of the statistics of the low percentage of prime contracts. Let us face these figures squarely and subject them to some commonsense analysis.

During a recent one-year period, fiscal year 1965, Oregon ranked thirty-second in population, 28th in personal income, and 28th in total federal taxes paid. In R & D obligations, Oregon ranked 28th. As to total military prime contract awards, Oregon ranked 39th, with \$90 million in awards. During 1966, on the strength of the 50% increase which you heard about yesterday, we rose as high as 37th.

Now why has Oregon been so far down the ladder?

All of us on the West Coast are aware, the military prime contracts which give California 18% of the nation's total, and Washington 14% (in comparison with Oregon's 3%) go to the large integrated manufacturers. They are capable not only of manufacturing, but of designing, engineering, and testing the complicated large-scale weapons systems. These figures do not include civilian procurements, and they do not include subcontracts which are important areas in which Oregon has widening footholds. Our prime contractors know that a good subcontracting program improves their profits and their ability to compete.

The defense industries with which we are familiar grew up in California and Washing-

ton over many years. They were located pursuant to decisions made literally two and three decades ago. It would be interesting to go into history and review the factors that were considered, such as relation to population centers, proximity to capital, low cost electric power, other industries, research facilities and other random factors. These actions were taken long ago, however, and the consequences of the plant locations cannot be undone.

The major part of our attention during these two days is devoted to examining how Oregon business can relate to such existing contractor and government business.

PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE ARE BRIGHT IN MARITIME RESEARCH AND PROGRAMS

But it also makes sense to me to look into the future. I feel that, with Oregon's endowment of resources—geographic, natural and personal—and the start that our businesses and institutions have already made—there are areas of potential government business that are bright with promise for the coming years.

One does not have to look far from here to survey Oregon's window on the world, its more than 500 miles of ocean coastline. We have the largest reserve of standing timber in the country. In our Small Business Committee hearings on export expansion in Portland this May, we were reminded again that the Columbia is the second greatest river system in the country, giving the Inland Empire access to the continents around the Pacific basin. These rimlands contain a growing majority of world population. Beyond our coasts are the vast reaches of the Pacific Ocean.

Consider for a moment as a small example, the potential in the development of fisheries and fish protein concentrate.

As we sit here today, two-thirds of the world's population suffers from malnutrition, especially the lack of animal protein. The population of the world is expected to double in the next 35 years. Thus, if the human race is to avert disaster, protein production must be more than doubled before the end of this century. Among the States, Oregon's famous fisheries are in 12th place, with an annual catch of about \$11 million. Commercial fishing also brings fringe benefits for our economy, including the stimulation of processing, shipyards, and related marine industries. But it came as something of a surprise to me that U.S. fisheries' production ranks behind Peru, Japan, Russia, and Communist China, and we may soon be passed by Norway.

Per capita consumption of fish in the U.S. last year rose 16%. In the next 15 years it is expected to increase more than 76%. At present, two-thirds of the fish consumed here was caught by foreign fisherman, whose techniques and equipment are, in many cases I am told, superior to our own.

What part will we play in exploring and developing the resources of the Pacific Ocean during the next two or three decades? I hope that the American reaction will be adequate. We would certainly want the ships and equipment and plants to remain in private ownership, and to be within reasonable financial means of our small, independent businessmen. These goals will not be achieved however, without pioneering in the form of research and pilot programs by the federal government and the maritime states, and imaginative participation by our business leaders.

AS THESE EFFORTS EXPAND OREGON SHOULD BE IN THE VANGUARD

The nation has hardly begun to come to grips with the implications and the potentials of the ocean resources, which are so near at hand.

From the material supplied by the National Science Foundation here today, we learn

that less than 4% of the ocean floor has been accurately mapped.

The federal government's total budget for marine science and technology stands substantially below \$500 million, representing less than 3% of the \$17 billion of federal R&D, to be spent this year. Can anyone doubt that these amounts and percentages will climb in the years ahead?

The hard facts make it clear to me that the nation must dramatically upgrade its marine sciences, both basic and applied. We must strengthen our grasp of oceanography, of fisheries and maritime technology—including factory-ship construction, aquaculture, exploratory fishing, and the production and utilization of protein concentrates. In the areas of education and research Oregon, in my opinion, has some of its finest opportunities to expand and to contribute to these national undertakings.

Anyone who has visited the Marine Science Center at Newport, the seafood study facility at Astoria, or the biology lab at Coos Bay, as I have been privileged to do, knows that our universities have begun to respond to those challenges, and our industries have begun to respond. The Oregon legislature backed its interest this year with \$500,000, to finance the entry of our State University into the new Sea Grant College program.

We are pleased to welcome to the conference spokesmen for both the civilian and defense ocean study programs: Mr. Robert Abel, the Director of the National Sea Grant section of the National Science Foundation; and Lt. Dennis MacDonell of the Naval Oceanographic Center. They are amply supplied with literature and expertise, and I think it would be well to learn as much about their activities as possible.

I would like to see Oregon in the vanguard of these programs.

OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS—IMPROVING "LIVABILITY" OF THE ENVIRONMENT

We could cite other areas of large potential investment by governments, including state and local units. These include air and water purification and waste disposal. Through the cooperation of the Department of the Interior, we have arranged for Mr. R. F. Poston, the Regional Director of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration Office at Portland to be present and to furnish individual counseling.

There is the whole gamut of problems of the cities, including new techniques in construction, with which our forestry industries are intimately concerned. We need to have a dialogue with the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs about its experimental programs, and this dialogue has been started. In these growth industries also we find in the Northwest a natural interest coupled with a wide-open field involving federal research and prototype programs.

We have mentioned trade. It is logical to think of exports in the commercial sense of offering products for sale. However, exports can also be thought of as providing for the essential human needs which people beyond our shores share. The free enterprise system of this country has developed the greatest capability in history of fulfilling these needs.

I am proud that the leading industries of this region are involved with furnishing food and shelter. I think that it is a worthy pursuit to learn more about how the worldwide hunger for these necessities can best be satisfied. This may involve a part of the \$17 billion being spent on research and development, the introduction of new products and processes, as well as the procurement of new equipment, and new facilities. We need to know what mixture of products, U.S. investments in overseas manufacturing, technical assistance, and education are best for our economy, and the economies of our friends overseas.

LAYING THE FOUNDATION—A LIBRARY OF SPECIFICATIONS

The time to lay a foundation for the future is now.

It is encouraging that, in connection with this Conference, there has been a coming together of ideas on the procurement issues that now affect the companies doing business with the government, and those who are making efforts in this direction.

For instance, there has been considerable discussion of establishing a repository of federal standards and specifications in Oregon.

I am told that there are more than 500 classes of these specifications containing about 60,000 individual items, some of which are quite long and detailed. Furthermore, they are constantly being modified. The operation of a repository to provide retrieval of up-to-date information of this sort thus involves a considerable commitment.

In the past, this information was available only at selected government contracting installations, mostly in other parts of the country. Recently, the first non-federal government public repository was set up in Seattle by the Washington State Department of Commerce.

As a result of preparing for this Conference, the Department of Defense has developed a demonstration, including a film, to show what is involved in establishing and using a repository. They have informed us that their package has already been of help to them in their dealings with contractors and government officials. The top civilian specialist has been assigned to make this presentation to us here.

Meanwhile, our people were exploring with the Department the possibility of founding a limited library in Oregon, covering perhaps 20% of the classes. If all the parties agree that such a partial repository should come into being, it could later be expanded, and could serve as a center for other procurement studies. I understand discussions are advancing satisfactorily, and that Mr. Albert C. Lazure of the Department of Defense announced this morning that he was prepared to recommend to the Secretary that certain portions of this material be furnished without cost to any Oregon institution willing to operate the facility in the prescribed manner. The Willamette Valley Research Council, particularly Jean Mater and others, deserve our gratitude for those initiatives, which I fully support.

From my contact with many of you in the past, I am also aware of other problems, such as the delay in obtaining bids and other materials from Eastern procurement activities. Communication is a problem in the procurement process under any circumstances, and it is magnified by distance. Much good work has been done in improving communications procedures by your speaker of yesterday, Mr. Douglas Strain. As a result, I can report that much has been achieved. More can and should be done.

Overall, there are two ways of improving our procurement performance. The first and easiest is through the organic growth of the businesses in the State. The second is by attracting new industry to locate in Oregon.

The challenges are rigorous, and the competition is strong, especially as to bringing in new companies. Dun and Bradstreet estimates that, for the 1,500 plant location decisions that are made each year, some 15,000 alternatives are considered. In my judgment, however, the resources within our borders and adjacent to them can support both sound expansion and new growth.

Furthermore, the type of industries we have been talking about do not pollute the water and the air. On the contrary, instead of detracting from the environment, they would tend to increase "live-ability"—in the city and in the countryside; here and elsewhere.

I feel that this is the kind of progress Oregon needs and wants, and that federal, state, and local procurement opportunities which are suitable and profitable, can play a part in this progress. It is apparent that capitalizing on these opportunities will take sustained, day-to-day effort by our State institutions and business groups. There should also be a synchronization of these activities with the Congressional delegation.

WHAT THE CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION CAN DO

Certain things can be accomplished in Washington. We can keep watch on the policies of the Executive Branch. Two weeks ago we acted upon a proposal to have Navy minesweepers built abroad. I opposed this arrangement, because it sacrificed the future of small American shipyards, which urgently need the business. These yards keep alive capabilities vital for national defense. I am glad to say Congress rejected this legislation.

We can work for and support enlightened policies in oceanography and fisheries, and trade expansion—programs which take full advantage of the character of our regional industries. I can assure you that we are doing this, and we are originating these proposals when they are not forthcoming from elsewhere.

For example, as a result of the export hearings in Portland, the Administration promptly filled the position of Secretary of Commerce to provide leadership in trade promotion, which is of such importance to the Pacific Northwest. Then, just two weeks ago, on September 12 the export program of the Small Business Administration, which had been in abeyance for some time, was formally re-established.

We can also aid in straightening out misunderstandings with government agencies and assure equal and equitable treatment for our businessmen in particular cases. The Small Business Committee, of which I am a senior member, can help us in this regard.

You will recall that the Congress took the lead in establishing the Small Business Administration in 1953, and in protecting its independence since. One of the primary missions conferred by the Act on SBA, and upon all other government departments, is assuring that small firms get a fair share of government contracts and subcontracts for the purchase of goods and services. In 1958, we amended the law to add "sales" of government property, so that small companies in the forest industry would have an even break in the sales of government timber.

Each year our Committee holds public hearings to review procurement developments and to see how this mandate is being carried out. We inquire into general policies, and can also delve into particular practices. Recommendations are made for legislative or administrative changes. Our hearings, and annual and special reports are freely available as a public service.

The several loan programs, management assistance, and certificate of competency program of the SBA, which are as close as Albert Lofstrand's office in Portland, can be key factors in helping your firms to enter the procurement field or expand your capabilities. I urge you to familiarize yourselves with these resources. The same should be said for the Commerce Department field office in Portland under the able direction of James Goodsell.

In our congressional undertakings, however, we must rely upon the guidance of our businessmen and organizations, who are involved in the procurement process and may be experiencing the actual difficulties.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CONFERENCE

This Conference is a fortunate opportunity for our business community, our State officials, our universities, and the Congressional delegation to discuss these prospects and problems. Out of such meetings I hope will come improved means for marshalling the

constant attention, the concerted effort, and the coordination of activities that are required to have an impact on the long-term development of procurement and other business in this State.

I will be pleased to do all that I can to assist in this work, which can do so much to build business here in Oregon which is compatible with our geography, the spirit of our State and its institutions, and its people.

TV AND THE RIOTS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the effect of television upon civil disorders has been a subject of increasing concern during this year of turmoil and violence in our urban areas.

Television brings events from distant places into our living rooms and has tended more and more to mold the opinions of those who watch it.

The manner in which television uses its vast influence can determine which men become heroes, and which villains. It has the power to convert a virtually unknown extremist with a handful of followers into a national figure. Each time a network decides to feature a Stokely Carmichael or a Rap Brown on its news and commentary programs, it is assisting such irresponsible agitators to achieve recognition as leaders of the Negro community both by white people and by Negroes who had never heard of them previously.

It leads young Negroes to believe that men like Carmichael and Brown are leaders to whom they should show respect, and on the other hand, it leads the general community to the erroneous conclusion that the majority of Negroes are involved in the violence of Detroit, Watts, and Harlem.

Both of these conclusions are clearly incorrect. The Stokely Carmichaels and Rap Browns are not leaders and, in fact, have no constituencies. The majority of Negroes are law-abiding citizens and are themselves the major victims of the violence such agitation has produced.

A recent article in TV Guide asks the question: "Do TV Cameras Add Fuel to Riot Flames?" Reporter Neil Hickey asked Detroit Police Commissioner Ray Girardin about the effects of television's presence in his city during this summer's riots in which 43 people died. His response was firm and unequivocal:

The showing of films of scenes from riot-torn areas seemed to arouse the curiosity of hundreds of people who wanted to see for themselves what was happening. Almost immediately the streets were crowded with curiosity-seekers hampering law enforcement officers. TV could have performed a civic duty by informing people to stay away from the dangerous sections. Many innocent people were injured and some killed by snipers because they wandered into the troubled areas to see the action.

Negro leaders have been equally outspoken in their criticism of television coverage of the riots. Henry Lee Moon, public relations chief of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, said:

Negroes have generally been unhappy about the way television has played their affairs. It's damaging to the cause of civil rights to give a forum to somebody shouting "Kill Whitey" and cast him as a Negro leader when he represents no substantial part of the Negro population.

Mr. Hickey points out that on many occasions TV newsmen have fanned the flames of violence in order to produce a better story. Many stations have responsibly adopted standards for use in riot situations, including holding off on reporting mass violence until police establish some modicum of control, and using unmarked cars, hand-held cameras, no bright lights, and exposing the cameras to public view only when there is something to film.

Still, many stations have not adopted such a code, and codes may not be the entire answer. Mr. Hickey concludes this way:

A part of television's difficulty in this area is inherent in the nature of the medium and will never be absolved altogether. But the opinion is now abroad that networks and stations must do a great deal more than they're doing to ensure that the medium (1) does not alter the shape of events it touches and (2) does not let itself be manipulated by the show business appeal of special pleaders.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Hickey's article, captioned "Do TV Cameras Add Fuel to Riot Flames?" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DO TV CAMERAS ADD FUEL TO RIOT FLAMES?

(By Nell Hickey)

A new law of television journalism is emerging in the atmosphere of civil protest, picketing, parades, demonstrations, labor strikes and the broad spectrum of public expression of discontent which has become a central aspect of American life in the last several years, and—more immediately—in the violent summer we have just weathered.

Stated most starkly, the law is: "Television, by its very presence, creates news."

Never before today has the law been more operative. Only in recent months have legislators, police officials and TV newsmen come to a suspicion of the full impact of television upon the news it is covering; of TV's power to shape events it chooses to record; of the medium's rather frightening capability of creating a cause, a public figure or a news story where—but for the cameras—none might otherwise exist.

The charge sheet against TV news is shaping up this way:

That the presence of cameras frequently transmutes a potentially violent situation into an *actually* violent one, and that mischief-makers often show their most troublesome selves at the sight of television crews.

That TV pictures of looting, destruction and mayhem create a contagion—far more so than radio or newspaper reports—which causes riots to feed upon themselves.

That TV stations and networks give too much time to the flashier and more vocal extremists—such as Stokely Carmichael and H. Rap Brown—whose words foster violence, and not enough to the less theatrical but saner voices of moderation.

That pressure groups of all types have become extremely "savvy" in manipulating television by staging protests and parades specifically for the cameras and thereby achieving an inflated importance for their private, special pleading.

These are only a few of the complaints—some of which have been denied by broadcasting executives—being aimed at TV news in the current controversy. TV Guide asked Detroit police commissioner Ray Girardin about the effects of television's presence in his city during this summer's terrible strife in which 43 people died. His response was firm and unequivocal: "The showing of films

of scenes from riot-torn areas seemed to arouse the curiosity of hundreds of people who wanted to see for themselves what was happening. Almost immediately, the streets were crowded with curiosity-seekers hampering law-enforcement officers.

"TV could have performed a civic duty," Girardin added, "by informing people to stay away from the dangerous sections. Many innocent people were injured and some killed by snipers because they wandered into the troubled areas to see the action."

Police officials in Newark, another scene of recent strife, are similarly disturbed about TV's riot coverage: "We were very disappointed by the behavior of TV crews," a spokesman says. "Doubly so since we had called a meeting as far back as June 23 and invited about 20 news organizations—both local and national—to discuss an informal 'code of ethics' for reporting trouble, should any arise. Three attended the meeting."

Sen. John McClellan (D., Ark.) plans to include testimony on TV's riot coverage in hearings currently in progress before his Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Congressman Torbert Macdonald (D., Mass.), chairman of the Communications Subcommittee, also is eager to call TV industry executives to Washington for hearings on the medium's capacity for exacerbating troublesome situations and creating new ones. Congressman Macdonald told us: "I'm not saying that Congress should interfere, but I wonder about the wisdom of what TV does in this area. Is it really news if one Negro gets up and shouts, 'Burn Whitey!'? I'd like to find out if the networks and stations have policies on these matters and what instructions they give their reporters."

The disturbances in the streets amount to rebellion, Macdonald added. "I'd like to know if this rebellion is being fed by television and radio. Television may have to take a share of the blame for spreading dangerous doctrines. I'd like to find out what steps they're taking to live up to their responsibility to their audiences."

Sen. Hugh Scott (R., Pa.) entered the controversy on Aug. 2 with a statement that he was "greatly concerned about the newspaper and radio and television coverage of the recent riots and civil disturbances throughout the country. I believe that the news media, in many instances, inadvertently contributed to the turmoil."

That salvo elicited return fire from all three networks. Dr. Frank Stanton, president of CBS, Inc., insisted that "so far as the news presented over our radio and television networks . . . goes, I can find no evidence that this is true. On the contrary, there is considerable evidence that the exact opposite is the case." At the same time Stanton admitted that "serious problems" attend television's handling of civil disorder and that his own news officials had been duly warned of the "unsettling effect on a stimulated crowd that the presence of cameras may have."

NBC president Julian Goodman echoed Stanton's disfavor of any "code of emergency procedure" (as suggested by Scott) that might impinge upon TV's freedom to cover the news as it sees fit. ". . . A code cannot exercise judgment," said Goodman. "It cannot foresee all the variables in the fast-breaking events with which newsmen must deal."

Another quick response to Scott's statement came from James C. Hagerty, vice president of American Broadcasting Company. In a "Dear Hugh" letter, Hagerty defended his network's news practices while adding that the whole subject has "been a matter of continuing concern to all of us here. . . . The danger that news coverage can influence or inflame an event is foremost in our thoughts."

Other criticism of TV news has come from pundits and private-interest groups. Colum-

nist Max Lerner says: "Americans seem to have struck a Faustian bargain with the big media, by which they have received total and instant coverage and have in turn handed themselves over to the vulnerable chances of crowd psychology and of instant infection."

Henry Lee Moon, public relations chief of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People told TV Guide: "Negroes have generally been unhappy about the way television has played their affairs. It's damaging to the cause of civil rights to give a forum to somebody shouting 'Kill Whitey' and cast him as a Negro leader when he represents no substantial part of the Negro population."

TV newsmen are as sensitive as anybody else to such dangers. ABC News executive William Sheehan says that he thinks "it's no coincidence that the flourishing of the civil-rights movement has occurred at the same time that television news has reached the point where every evening it literally saturates the country with reports on world happenings."

Another TV executive recalls that during the AFTRA strike of last March, when TV reporters were idle for two weeks, a sharp diminution in protests and picketing for peace and other causes was apparent. "Nothing seemed to be happening," he says. Then the TV news directors realized that—in the absence of cameras—the protestors had concluded it was pointless to mount a protest.

TV people become aware of their own influence in a variety of ways. Cindy Adams, a glamorous reporter for WABC-TV in New York, recalls the time she accepted a telephone call in her newsroom and was informed that a private group planned a demonstration at the Dominican Republic's UN mission headquarters to protest U.S. involvement in that country's affairs. "Can you cover it?" asked the lady caller.

"Well, I'm not sure," Cindy said. "How many of you will there be?"

"How many do you need?" the woman answered.

A bit startled, Cindy replied that it wasn't exactly her place to say. "What time will you be demonstrating?" the reporter then asked.

"Maybe right away. That suit you?"

"Well, we have no crews here right now," said Cindy.

"We'll have as many marchers as you want out there any time you say," the caller assured her. WABC did indeed cover the demonstration, moving Cindy Adams to recall recently: "That woman knew what she was doing; she was savvy in the ways of TV news." An increasing number of social and political activists are learning that it is possible to manipulate TV news to their own interests.

Similarly, TV people have been known to attempt the manipulation of an incipient news story to their own interests. When James Meredith was testing the University of Mississippi's exclusion policy, a potentially volatile situation grew out of the student body's tension and anger over his presence. A TV reporter from a Southwestern station drove onto the campus one day, hoping for some exciting newsmen. He was disappointed that the students' mood seemed taut but controlled. He leaned from his car and shouted to a group of them: "Hey! Where's the action? I heard there was action going on around here!"

That triggered them. First, they turned the newsman's car over and burned it, sending him scrambling; the violence spread from there. At the end of it, two men were dead.

Many observers are sure that TV news (as well as newspapers) fanned the embers which erupted into the bitter riots of the Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant section of New York in the summer of 1964. During spring and early summer, almost daily interviews with "Negro leaders" predicting a holocaust were

visible on television. Many of these men were spokesmen without a following, ambitious activists eager for exposure. But their words created an air of tension and expectancy, convincing the ghetto dwellers that violence was indeed imminent. Nobody was surprised when it came.

In Los Angeles in 1965, mobile TV vans moved into riot areas of Watts and showed live pictures of looting even before the police had arrived. A police official remembers: "Television served as a terrific guide for potential looters who wanted to know where to go for some action."

Still, there's no gainsaying that TV reporters as a class are well aware of the effect of their presence on an evolving story. We asked a number of network correspondents—experienced in coverage of street demonstrations—for their thoughts:

Tom Jarriel, ABC: "There's no doubt that a camera causes pickets to act up more vigorously. They know the power of TV exposure; all these people want their story told. The camera is an attraction. The problem is to keep it from becoming a bigger story than the one you're covering."

"We often leave our cameras on the seat of the car and stand to one side while a situation is developing. When something actually happens, we film it."

Jarriel feels that the TV presence also can have a moderating influence. "I doubt that James Meredith would have completed his most recent march in Mississippi unmolested if the cameras hadn't been there. People didn't heckle him; they stayed away so as not to cause a major incident on nationwide TV."

John Laurence, CBS: "More trouble is caused by young and inexperienced wire-service reporters than by TV men. They can make a quick phone call and in minutes a bulletin is going out on their wires. The presence of a TV camera often tends more to keep a situation honest than to aggravate it. If a camera is on a policeman and his prisoner, chances are the policeman won't beat the prisoner and the prisoner won't attack the policeman."

Don Oliver, NBC: "Once a public disturbance has begun, cameras have very little effect on its progress, but in the early stages—where the possibility for violence exists—the sight of a TV crew can have a bad effect. Police and TV people work well together most of the time; but as a riot goes into its third or fourth day, the police get edgy and angry and start feeling that the cameras are drawing attention to them."

Bill Matney, NBC: "Cameras have very little effect while a disturbance is actually going on. In Detroit, I interviewed two fellows while they were actually looting, and later filmed their arrest. On one day, while whole sections of the city were going up in smoke, the TV people refrained from reporting it so as not to make it worse. That was an independently-arrived-at decision by the local stations."

CBS's Midwest bureau manager, Dan Bloom, had the job of setting up that network's riot coverage in a number of cities during the summer. "It boils down to the fact that the equipment is sometimes a magnet," he says. "But our policy is simple. If a reporter has any suspicion that a performance is going on just for the camera, we immediately pack up and move away. This is rigidly enforced. On the other hand, if you have a peaceful demonstration that goes on for 60 minutes and a bomb is thrown in the last two minutes, where is the story? We'd be remiss if we didn't put that part of the action on the air. We make a very deliberate attempt at setting the proper balance."

Before this past summer, many TV news-men were understandably reluctant to admit television's influence on evolving news, but the proliferation of protests and riots, as well as the thoughtful criticism of lawmakers and private citizens, are forcing the subject onto center stage, where it must now

be examined in full public view, and some firm conclusions arrived at. CBS News president Richard S. Salant, for example, admits, "It is certainly true that a great many events—almost all except tornadoes—are, at least to some degree, designed in time or in place or even in nature for all of the mass media. ... But our job is to report news, not to shape it."

And there are no easy, self-executing rules applicable to all situations, Salant adds. "We know that one cannot simply ignore these events because indeed they are news. And we have come to the conclusion, then, that the wise policy is a policy of restraint and awareness of what the problems are."

For the last several years, the U.S. Justice Department's Community Relations Service has been working quietly in cities across the country getting TV people together with police officials and helping them agree on voluntary guidelines for the reporting of civil disorders. Together, they've come up with solid recommendations aimed at keeping good order in the streets while not raising the ugly specter of censorship. Scores of TV stations have agreed to:

Hold off reporting mass violence until police establish some modicum of control.

Use unmarked cars, hand-held cameras, no bright lights, and expose the cameras to public view only when there's something to film.

Avoid reporting rumors, trivia and wild statements.

Use command posts set up by police in strife areas as clearinghouses for news breaks, and not cruise about the streets aimlessly.

Refrain from using the word "riot" unless there's simply no other word to describe what's happening.

The networks and many local stations try to do many of these things out of common sense, and not from official nudging. But it's apparent that no guidelines or agreements can replace the dispassion and detachment of a seasoned TV newsmen who is determined to convey—soberly and untheatrically—the full sense of a public disorder; whose eye is not upon competing newsmen nor on the aggrandizement of his own reputation; and who is sensitive to the effect of his words upon an anxious audience.

A part of television's difficulty in this area is inherent in the nature of the medium and will never be absolved altogether. But the opinion is now abroad that networks and stations must do a great deal more than they're doing to ensure that the medium 1) does not alter the shape of events it touches and 2) does not let itself be manipulated by the show-business appeal of special pleaders.

It is apparent that the adaptation of rigid "codes" is not the answer. But, if, indeed, television's self-generating potential for news is an operative unwritten "law" of broadcast journalism, it is a law in need of prompt and drastic—unwritten but nonetheless effective—amendment.

AT LAST, POSTAWARD AUDITS ORDERED BY DEFENSE

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the Department of Defense has moved to plug a gaping hole in its procurement procedures, which has been costing the taxpayers millions of dollars a year in overcharges on defense contracts.

In a memorandum made public yesterday, Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul H. Nitze issued orders which effectively translate into executive action the legislative intent of a bill I introduced 4 months ago. The Comptroller General has indicated that he is satisfied that this will do the job.

My bill—S. 1913—which would require postaward audits on defense contracts grew out of 4 days of hearings last May

on Federal procurement procedures conducted by the Subcommittee on Economy in Government of the Joint Economic Committee.

The Pentagon's shocking failure to adequately enforce the 1962 Truth in Negotiations Act was brought out very clearly during the hearings in testimony by the Comptroller General, Congress' watchdog over the executive branch. This act, which requires that contracting officers obtain current, accurate and complete cost data from contractors, is the taxpayer's only defense against the establishment of unreasonably high cost levels in negotiated contracts.

The Comptroller General pointed out that the Pentagon's failure to postaudit contracts has been a major factor in contract overpricing. He told the Subcommittee of repeated efforts by his office over the years to persuade the Pentagon to adopt a postaudit policy which would allow them to make sure that actual costs incurred in the performance of a contract were in line with estimated costs given at the time the contract was awarded.

In minimal spot checking, the General Accounting Office uncovered a high number of shocking discrepancies between the original contract estimate and the postaudit figure. In 242 contracts checked, the GAO found 177 cases of inflated pricing for an overcharge in just this handful of contracts of \$130 million.

Secretary Nitze's memorandum now establishes just the policy the GAO has been urging and the policy my bill would establish through legislation. The memorandum states that "action shall be taken to include in all noncompetitive firm fixed price contracts involving certified costs or pricing data, a contractual right to have access to the contractor's actual performance records" in order to provide assurance that "defective cost or pricing data had not been submitted prior to consummation of the contract."

The Pentagon should have adopted this policy long ago. Nevertheless, Secretary Nitze is to be congratulated for issuing this memorandum. It takes a long step in the right direction—toward providing the taxpayer with an adequate defense against blatant profiteering on defense contracts.

I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Nitze's memorandum be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, September 29, 1967.

Memorandum for Secretaries of the Military Departments, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), Assistant Secretary of Defense (I&L), Directors of Defense Agencies.

Subject: Access to cost performance records on noncompetitive firm fixed price contracts.

I have given careful consideration to the arguments for and against access to contractor post-award cost performance records on noncompetitive firm fixed price contracts, for the purpose of determining the degree of contractor compliance with PL 87-653. Clearly, it has been and remains our policy that in firm fixed price contracts the cost and profit consequences are the full responsi-

bility of the contractor since he assumes all the risk of performing in accordance with the contract. Likewise, it is our policy that such contracts be used only where there exists a reliable basis for judging reasonableness of contractor cost estimates. Where such a basis does not exist, other contract forms should be used.

The Department of Defense is required to conduct a program of review and audit sufficient to ascertain that the cost or pricing data submitted by contractors in connection with the negotiation of noncompetitive firm fixed price contracts were current, accurate and complete as required by PL 87-653. It is our policy to make such audits, as fully as possible, prior to completing the negotiation of the contract. However, when it is necessary to provide assurance that defective cost or pricing data were not submitted, audits should also be conducted of actual costs incurred after contracts are consummated. To assure that such post-award audits may be conducted when deemed appropriate, action shall be taken to include in all non-competitive firm fixed price contracts involving certified costs or pricing data, a contractual right to have access to the contractor's actual performance records.

Circumstances which may dictate the use of a post-award cost performance audit include such cases as those where: (1) factors of urgency in placing the initial procurement were clearly present; (2) material costs are a significant portion of the contractor's total cost estimate; (3) a substantial portion of the contract is proposed for subcontracting; or (4) there was a substantial interval between completion of a the pre-contract cost evaluation and agreement on price.

In directing this action, I wish to make it clear that the purpose of any post-award cost performance audit, as provided herein, is limited to the single purpose of determining whether or not defective cost or pricing data were submitted. Access to a contractor's records shall not be for the purpose of evaluating profit-cost relationships, nor shall any repricing of such contracts be made because the realized profit was greater than was forecast, or because some contingency cited by the contractor in his submission failed to materialize—unless the audit reveals that the cost and pricing data certified by the contractor were, in fact, defective.

I desire that the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) and the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) issue implementing instructions to place the above policies into effect.

PAUL H. NITZE.

VIETNAM

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I wish to share with Senators and all other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent letter I received recently on the war in Vietnam from Maryland's distinguished State Senator, Harry Hughes, the majority leader of Maryland's State Senate. His letter is an articulate expression of what I believe to be an ever-growing concern of the American people with our involvement in Vietnam. Senator Hughes' call for diplomatic flexibility instead of reliance upon false honor or pride to find a solution in Vietnam strikes the right note. Senator Hughes has again demonstrated his ability to deal with complex issues.

I had the honor of serving with Harry Hughes in the Maryland House of Delegates from 1955 to 1959. In 1959, Harry was elevated to the Maryland Senate and has served in that body with great distinction since that time. As majority

leader of the senate, he has won the respect and admiration of his fellow legislators. As chairman of the committee on taxation and fiscal matters, he coauthored the "Cooper-Hughes" tax reform plan which was enacted during the last session of the legislature as the "Agnew-Hughes-Lee" tax reform proposal. That measure, Mr. President, was termed a "model of responsibility and fiscal soundness" by no less an authority than Joseph A. Peckman, director of economic studies, the Brookings Institution, and coauthor of the well-known Heller-Peckman plan for Federal tax sharing with the States.

Senator Hughes is an extremely able legislator, and I commend his view on the Vietnam situation to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that his letter to me, dated September 25, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE OF MARYLAND,

Annapolis, Md., September 25, 1967.

Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOE: I have read with interest your speech on the war in Vietnam given at the University of Maryland.

In commenting on this speech, as requested by you, I must preface my remarks with the obvious statement that my knowledge and information, like the rest of the public, emanates solely from what I have been exposed to through the press and is considerably less than yours and others in responsible positions of authority related to our foreign affairs. Consequently, it cannot be assumed that I speak from an informed position.

However, I am greatly disturbed about the war in Vietnam—the tremendous loss of American lives, the ever increasing and extremely high cost in American dollars, the restrictions and sacrifices it imposes upon meeting domestic programs, the apparent lack of enthusiasm and singlemindedness of purpose among the Vietnamese people regarding the war and its goal, the adverse effect the war seems to be having on our relations with our allies throughout the world, etc. None of these matters of concern is novel to me. They are touched upon in your speech and are disturbing to an evergrowing number of Americans. One cannot help but be aware of this in his daily contacts with people, the press and numerous periodicals.

Consequently, I am inclined to agree with the views set forth in your speech. I believe a complete and objective re-evaluation of our involvement in Vietnam is imperative. I agree with you that the election of a new government in Vietnam offers an opportunity for this re-evaluation that should not be ignored.

In making this re-evaluation (and hopefully sincere negotiations for peace), I would hope that we would not be guided by past commitments possibly made upon mistaken premises. Pride and honor are certainly not to be discounted in upholding the prestige and integrity of any country. But blindly adhering to obsolete commitments based upon the premises, of another time resulting in a tragic loss of lives and a seriously damaging financial drain, becomes false pride and false honor and the justification of maintaining prestige and integrity falls miserably. In fairness to those who have died, to those who live and to future Americans we cannot ignore past mistakes, changing circumstances, existing realities and a

realistic evaluation of accomplishments and goals. In other words, our thinking must be flexible, not rigid, and our course of action must be decided by intelligent decisions based upon accurate, sound and current information, not unduly influenced by the industrial-military complex, either theirs or ours.

In closing I would like to make one brief comment about whether or not we should continue bombing North Vietnam and escalating the war. To say the least, the military success of the bombings and escalation appears to be doubtful. On the other hand, I cannot believe that they have not had some favorable effect from a military standpoint. The point, however, is whether or not whatever military success has been realized by the bombings justifies the loss of lives and planes, the damage to our image in the world and the possible damage to our efforts towards peace negotiations.

I recently read of a commission established by President Roosevelt during World War II to make a bombing survey. The purpose of this commission was to objectively determine whether or not the results of the bombing of certain cities justified the death and destruction caused by the bombing. It would seem to me that such a survey made by an impartial, well-staffed, highly authoritative and empowered commission of capable people is in order with regard to the bombing of North Vietnam. This has become a very controversial and emotional issue in this country and a complete, impartial and intelligent review of the bombings and their effect, with a report to the people, might be most helpful. I am sure you are aware of such a proposal.

This has been a rather lengthy letter but the subject matter is most serious and complicated and not subject to simple, brief comments. I hope they are helpful to you even though coming from a poorly informed source.

With best regards, I am

Sincerely,

HARRY R. HUGHES.

LABORATORY ANIMAL LEGISLATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, controversy continues to rage over the question of the best way to eliminate intolerable conditions in laboratory animal-care facilities. Despite the fact that there is already effective, though inadequately funded, animal-welfare legislation on the books, a new bill has recently been introduced in the House and the Senate which would nullify the existing law.

The most dismayed provision of the new bill calls for self-policing of laboratory animal-care facilities, thereby eliminating the requirement for Federal inspection and licensing by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the agency presently charged with that responsibility. Experience has demonstrated that self-policing does not work. It did not work in the drug field. It will not work in the laboratory animal field either. I appeal to Congress not to place regulatory responsibility in the hands of those who have a vested interest in evading compliance with presently established standards.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent editorial on the subject, published in today's Washington Post, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROTECTING ANIMALS

Medical research leaders have suddenly become so zealous for the protection of animals involved in laboratory experimentation that they now want to take over the protecting job themselves. They have been vehemently opposed to protection in the past and were unable to find a kind word to say for P.L. 89-544, the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act, when it was passed overwhelmingly by the 89th Congress. Miraculously converted and reformed, however, they have become ardent supporters of a Johnny-come-lately bill proposed by Sen. Jacob Javits and Rep. Paul Rogers.

The Javits-Rogers proposal has admirable features. It would extend protection to all warm-blooded animals, while the existing law covers only dogs, cats, monkeys, hamsters, guinea pigs and rabbits. It would widen the coverage of laboratories and protect research animals throughout their stay in a laboratory, while the existing law protects them only when they are in the hands of dealers and in the laboratory before and after experimentation. We support such protection wholeheartedly.

But the Javits-Rogers proposal would wreck the existing law by the simple device of shifting the inspection of laboratories and research centers from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Could it be that the medical research leaders prefer to entrust enforcement to HEW because they are so influential in that Department through the National Institutes of Health?

The Javits-Rogers proposal threatens to vitiate enforcement in an even worse way—by allowing HEW to delegate inspection and the licensing of laboratories to "professional bodies." The obvious "professional body" in this field is the American Association for the Advancement of Laboratory Animal Care, sponsored by the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association and the American Medical Association. It sounds a little like assigning Cosa Nostra to guard the banks.

If Messrs. Rogers and Javits really want to improve the protection of research animals, let them safeguard the gains made last year and take their improvements to the Senate Commerce Committee—instead of trying to circumvent that experienced body. And if the AMA really wants to promote animal welfare, let it start lobbying for the funds needed to police last year's law, P.L. 89-544.

BETTER PRIORITIES NEEDED FOR CONTROLLING FEDERAL SPENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it has been my strong conviction that if Congress is to control Federal spending effectively, it needs help in determining the relative priorities of different programs. As we are all aware, the present budget process is fragmentary; that is, each appropriation bill is considered separately, so that there is never any opportunity to take a broad view of the entire budget. This system makes it extremely difficult for Congress to make judicious cuts in the President's budget, as is so painfully obvious this year.

This great need for better program evaluation and better determination of priorities underlies my bill, S. 2032, which would set up a Government Commission to review both old and new Federal programs to determine their cost effectiveness. The Commission would provide Congress with a rational set of program priorities and would make it possible for

Congress to postpone those Federal activities least needed. It would eliminate the need for desperate meatax cuts which affect good programs as well as bad.

The need for such a rational system for establishing priorities was emphatically pointed out in an editorial entitled "Priorities, Not Curbs," published in Sunday's Washington Post. I was especially gratified that the editorial mentioned the testimony received by the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on Economy in Government regarding the misallocation of resources by the Federal Government through use of unrealistically low discount rates.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIORITIES, NOT CURBS

The House action in sending back a routine financing bill to the Appropriations Committee for reduction comes as no surprise. The proposals for an income tax surcharge and the widespread feeling that Federal spending has gotten out of control are engendering a sense of frustration. But the meat-ax approach of across-the-board expenditure reductions for non-defense programs will be counterproductive. If expenditures are to be controlled in a rational fashion, Congress should establish priorities and then proceed to fund those programs which promise to satisfy the most pressing needs.

The goals that a country can realize through public expenditure—better education, more habitable cities, cleaner rivers or security from external threats—are over the longer run jointly determined by its wealth and the resources that its citizens are willing to transfer by taxation from private consumption to the public sector. This is a very rich country, but there are nonetheless limits on the rapidity with which public expenditures can grow without a concomitant reduction in private expenditures or a serious price inflation. That limit is not approached in periods of idle productive capacity, but it does exist. Congress knows through its political antennae that the electorate will at any time demand more Federal services than it is willing to pay for through taxation. So does the President. That is why there are efforts, unfortunately ineffectual efforts, to establish priorities, to decide which Federal programs should take precedence over others. Only by establishing priorities and measures of the effectiveness of Government programs can a society pursue its goals in a rational fashion.

The objection to expenditure curbs is that they fall to go to the root of the matter. Across-the-board reductions affect all programs, the good and the bad, in an indiscriminate fashion. As a result of delays, the cost of some good programs may well be increased. Furthermore, there is no sound justification for concentrating all the fire on nondefense programs. Can it be assumed that all the defense programs are essential? If there is waste and inefficiency in the Federal establishment, is there any reason for believing that the defense programs are somehow exempt? It is axiomatic that all the progress of the Federal Government cannot be assigned the same priority, nor are they equally effective in attaining their stated goals.

But neither the Congress nor the Executive is facing up squarely to the need for a system of establishing expenditure priorities. Three witnesses, respected economists, recently testified before the Joint Economic Committee that billions of dollars are being wasted every year because the wrong interest rate is used to determine the benefits of public

works projects. Senator Proxmire put the matter bluntly when he said that: "We make no effort to determine whether the Federal Government can better invest funds . . . or whether it is wiser to leave that investment to the private economy. We have no sensible ways of determining whether we are going to get back in benefits the costs of the billions of dollars which this Government invests every year."

Curbs that are fashioned in a fever pitch of anger will not reverse the trend of Federal expenditure. At best it will check the rise for more than a single year; at worst it will disrupt effective programs. There is, in short no alternative to a rational system for establishing priorities.

HUMANE CARE FOR LABORATORY ANIMALS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, last year the Senate approved by a 85-to-0 vote the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act, which for the first time, provides humane care and treatment for the thousands of animals used in laboratory research. The act, Public Law 89-544, applies to both animal dealers and research laboratories. It authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to administer and enforce the program.

On September 27 the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] introduced a bill with the appealing title, "Humane Laboratory Animal Treatment Act of 1967," which would repeal Public Law 89-544 and permit the research laboratories, which have fought so long and hard against any regulation or requirement for humane treatment, to police their own actions. It would take away the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to require humane care and treatment of animals by research laboratories.

There was strong editorial support throughout the country last year for Public Law 89-544. That support remains. I am delighted that leading editorial writers are so alert to the seemingly innocuous, but deadly, provisions of Senator JAVITS' bill, which would eliminate the effective regulation of research laboratories.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD editorials published in the Christian Science Monitor, the Evening Star, the Courier-Journal & Times, and the Washington Post, which expose the Javits bill for what it is—an attempt to undo what Congress did last year by repealing effective animal-care regulation of research laboratories.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 21, 1967]

LABORATORY ANIMAL WELFARE

When the 89th Congress, by an overwhelming majority, passed P.L. 89-544, the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act, humanitarians might well have supposed that relief from intolerable conditions on dealers' premises, in transit, and in research laboratories was in sight. But behind-the-scenes opposition has been quietly at work to delay and to nullify.

Sen. Jacob Javits has circulated the Senate with a letter asking for cosponsors on a draft of a new laboratory animal bill. It has been characterized by Senator Javits as

an "extension of P.L. 89-544"; but in reality it would repeal the major coverage of that act, which is to regulate conditions in laboratories and medical research centers. Senator Javits' proposed bill would still leave with the Department of Agriculture the enforcement of that part of the law involving dealers' premises. But it would take away from that department the enforcement of the clauses involving laboratories and medical research centers and would transfer it to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This department would, in turn, be authorized to delegate the inspection to "professional bodies." The main accrediting body would almost certainly be the American Association for the Advancement of Laboratory Animal Care, which is sponsored by such groups as the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association and the American Medical Association. These groups would obviously be liable to motivation by self-interest. Yet Senator Javits' proposal would use taxpayer's money to pay for this self-policing.

As P.L. 89-544 now stands, the inspection of both dealers' premises and laboratories is carried out by veterinarians employed by the Department of Agriculture—men who bring to the job an objective viewpoint, with no self-interest involved.

Senator Javits has stated that he and Congressman Paul Rogers will introduce the new bill concurrently in Senate and House. Such a bill should attract no cosponsors in the Senate, and its companion bill should receive no support in the House. Self-policing by vested interests must be no part of any law designed for the protection of laboratory animals.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 23, 1967]

ANIMAL WELFARE, ROUND 2

According to a letter he has mailed to colleagues, Senator Javits of New York plans to introduce a bill soon, similar to one by Representative Rogers of Florida, which would tinker with the sensible Laboratory Animal Welfare Act enacted last year.

On the face of it, his amendment bears a humanitarian label. It would repeal a section of the law and require laboratory researchers to administer anesthesia to animals they are using in those experiments likely to cause pain.

But this clause, apparently a sop to the antivivisectionists, carries a price tag. First, it is hedged by an exception that anesthesia needn't be used if it would "defeat the objective" of the experiment.

Other more sweeping changes also are proposed. Regulatory authority over laboratories would be taken away from the Department of Agriculture, which is impartial and has no axe to grind in this matter, and would be given to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare which fought the bill as enacted last year. Furthermore, HEW would be empowered to farm out inspection of laboratories to a private group. It seems highly likely this would be the same outfit friendly to the medical fraternity that was proposed last year in a defeated amendment.

The motive for the Javits-Rogers bills seems clear. They have bought the line that the present law is a move toward federal control over research, and that the best way to weaken this is by bankrolling a private inspection organization that will not embarrass laboratories with over-zealous inspections.

The present law, if backed with adequate funds, will do the job. It will not be improved by the Javits-Rogers amendment.

[From the Courier-Journal & Times, Sept. 24, 1967]

THIS ACT WOULD HURT, NOT HELP ANIMALS
When a long fight ends in the adoption of a satisfactory law, it is a great pity to

tamper with it. Such a battle, led by dedicated and determined women all over America, resulted in the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966. Its official designation is P.L. 89-544.

Now come Rep. Paul Rogers and Sen. Jacob Javits with a joint bill which purports to improve last year's measure. Unfortunately, their bill would have the opposite effect. It would weaken the 1966 act and disrupt its administration, even before it has had a chance to prove its workability.

The Rogers-Javits bill would take the enforcement of humane standards in animal laboratories out of the hands of the Department of Agriculture and put it under the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This sounds like a harmless shift from one government agency to another. What it really entails, however, is a new set of standards to replace the good requirements now in use.

Inspection and accreditation of animal laboratories, too, would pass to outside groups which have an interest in maintaining relatively lax standards of care. One visit would serve to accredit a laboratory for five years, without a second inspection.

Javits and Rogers call their bill a mere "extension" of P.L. 89-544. But what it really represents is a fundamental change, which would give less protection than mere.

The 1966 bill was thrashed out after years of work and extensive hearings. It should be allowed to stand without amendment, at least for a reasonable period of trial.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 2, 1967]

PROTECTING ANIMALS

Medical research leaders have suddenly become so zealous for the protection of animals involved in laboratory experimentation that they now want to take over the protecting job themselves. They have been vehemently opposed to protection in the past and were unable to find a kind word to say for P.L. 89-544, the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act, when it was passed overwhelmingly by the 89th Congress. Miraculously converted and reformed, however, they have become ardent supporters of a Johnny-come-lately bill proposed by Sen. Jacob Javits and Rep. Paul Rogers.

The Javits-Rogers proposal has admirable features. It would extend protection to all warmblooded animals, while the existing law covers only dogs, cats, monkeys, hamsters, guinea pigs and rabbits. It would widen the coverage of laboratories and protect research animals throughout their stay in a laboratory, while the existing law protects them only when they are in the hands of dealers and in the laboratory before and after experimentation. We support such protection wholeheartedly.

But the Javits-Rogers proposal would wreck the existing law by the simple device of shifting the inspection of laboratories and research centers from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Could it be that the medical research leaders prefer to entrust enforcement to HEW because they are so influential in that Department through the National Institutes of Health?

The Javits-Rogers proposal threatens to vitiate enforcement in an even worse way—by allowing HEW to delegate inspection and the licensing of laboratories to "professional bodies." The obvious "professional body" in this field is the American Association for the Advancement of Laboratory Animal Care, sponsored by the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association and the American Medical Association. It sounds a little like assigning Cosa Nostra to guard the banks.

If Messrs. Rogers and Javits really want to improve the protection of research animals, let them safeguard the gains made last

year and take their improvements to the Senate Commerce Committee—instead of trying to circumvent that experienced body. And if the AMA really wants to promote animal welfare, let it start lobbying for the funds needed to police last year's law, P.L. 89-544.

ELECTION OF NEW BOARD OF FOREIGN SERVICE ASSOCIATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the New York Times of September 29 reported the election of a new board of the Foreign Service Association, an election which was apparently the product of a write-in campaign aimed at providing the association with more activist-minded leadership. This development strikes me as a good sign for the future of the Foreign Service.

The election was, however, a sign that the present state of affairs in the Foreign Service is apparently quite unsatisfactory in many respects. The New York Times reported the remark, attributed to an Association spokesman, that the election reflects "a general mood of grievance and concern, a sense of frustration and malaise about the state of morale" at the State Department and among career officers of the Agency for International Development and the U.S. Information Agency. The article went on to note that the problems which worry officers of these agencies include "the demand of career officers at all levels for more responsibility, more pay at lower grades and a more acceptable system of promotion and career planning at the upper grades."

These comments do not come as news to any of us familiar with the Foreign Service. As I have pointed out on the floor of the Senate, anyone who has more than a superficial contact with the Foreign Service, and with AID and USIA, knows that morale in these organizations leaves much to be desired. On June 20, I said on the floor that I thought that the time had come "to make a comprehensive study of this country's requirements, present resources, and future needs not only in the Department of State and Foreign Service but also in USIA, AID, the Department of Defense, and the other principal government agencies involved in foreign affairs." I mentioned that I had written the President in October 1966, "suggesting that he consider appointing a high-level, blue-ribbon Presidential committee to take a new, thorough, and objective look at these organizational problems." I added that it seemed logical to me "that the Department would be glad to see such a committee established and would feel a responsibility to its employees to see that the best available minds in the United States were set to work" on these problems.

My proposal does not seem to have been received with much enthusiasm by the Department of State. On August 2, I wrote Under Secretary of State Nicholas Katzenbach, mentioning my suggestion again and pointing out to him that the discussions in the committee on several recent legislative proposals relating to USIA and AID personnel "showed clearly that there is a growing feeling in the

committee that the time has come to drop the piecemeal approach in favor of making a thorough study."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Diplomats' Group Elects Activists," published in the September 29 issue of the New York Times, and my letter of August 2 to Under Secretary Katzenbach be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIPLOMATS' GROUP ELECTS ACTIVISTS—WRITE-IN SLATE GAINS CONTROL OF FOREIGN SERVICE SOCIETY

WASHINGTON, September 28.—A slate of activist-minded Foreign Service officers, campaigning on a write-in-ticket that promised fellow professional diplomats a chance to air their grievances, took control of the 7,000-member Foreign Service Association today.

A spokesman said the slate's victory in what had traditionally been routine annual elections of the professional group reflected "a general mood of grievance and concern, a sense of frustration and malaise about the state of morale" at the State Department and among career officers at the Agency for International Development and the United States Information Agency.

Lannon Walker, the new board chairman of the association, said the mood had developed over the last 18 months.

"This has been going on for some time in small groups—talking, writing papers, open letters and so forth," said Mr. Walker, 31 years old, a middle-level officer. "A couple of us decided about six months ago that we'd better stop talking and start organizing."

A SAY IN THEIR CAREERS

"Our decision to run for office was to give ourselves a more powerful position from which to take independent positions to that foreign affairs professionals would, for the first time, have a say in what their careers should be and how the foreign affairs community should be organized," Mr. Walker said. "And we feel these views should be stated clearly and forcefully."

Mr. Walker and other new officers shied away from calling their campaign a "Young Turk" movement, noting that three of the 11 new directors of the association were senior officers.

But they acknowledged that much of the impetus had come from junior-level and middle-level officers who had been dissatisfied with the relative inactivity of the association.

The association, a private organization for career officers in the State Department, the A.I.D., the U.S.I.A. and the Peace Corps, was established in 1918.

In the past, the State Department and other agencies have consulted association officers on personnel and administrative matters affecting career officers.

SPIRIT OF FRATERNITY

Its purposes have been to promote the spirit of fraternity among professional foreign affairs officers and to project their good name and well-being. The association had a voice in the preparation of the Foreign Service Act of 1946. Nonetheless, many Foreign Service officers say that until now the association has amounted to what one called "a company union."

The new board of directors, chosen indirectly in worldwide balloting between July 1 and Sept. 10, has an average age of 36. It includes two junior officers, equivalent to Army captains; six middle-grade officers, equivalent to Army majors and colonels, and three senior officers, equivalent to brigadier and major generals.

Mr. Walker, who joined the Foreign Service in 1961 after serving in the Air Force, is

chairman. Theodore L. Eliot Jr., 39, who has been in the State Department for 18 years, is vice-chairman.

KOHLER PRAISES ACTIVISM

The president of the association, re-appointed by the new board, is Foy D. Kohler, Deputy Under Secretary of State and the ranking career diplomat in the Foreign Service.

In a speech to an association meeting today, Mr. Kohler praised the bold spirit of the new board. He observed that in the past the Foreign Service had "given the appearance of dreading change."

He said he was "pleased" by the new spirit of activism.

"I refer to an inclination to look the world straight in the eye, take its measure without finching or equivocation and to respond to its challenges," he said.

He also praised a number of transitional studies started under the auspices of the out-going board.

One, he noted, recommended that the association concentrate "on becoming an organization with a serious intellectual base and an active—even combative—concern for the people at the heart of foreign affairs, regardless of their agency affiliation."

Mr. Kohler also referred to exploratory talks with labor unions of comparable professional or Government employees such as the American Federation of Government Employees and the National Federation of Professional Organizations.

The new board of directors has not yet made public any specific program, other officers said. But the private comments of several new board members and other diplomats indicated the following general areas of concern:

PERSONNEL PROBLEMS

This includes the demand of career officers at all levels for more responsibility, more pay at lower grades and a more equitable system of promotion and career planning at the upper grades.

The situation is aggravated, new leaders maintain, by the top-heavy structure of the Foreign Service, which is now overloaded with senior officers. Some of these say privately they are concerned about new regulations that would force them into early retirement if they remain in any individual grade for too many years.

"In some cases," said a sympathetic middle-grade officer who asked to remain anonymous, "this would penalize some of our brighter lights. These were the guys who were promoted fast to the top ranks ten years ago and then, because of the logjam at the top, have had to stay there."

Others worry in private about what they consider to be a shift toward the military career system, in which many officers count on leaving after 20 years of active duty.

"If this is what is going to be expected. We want to know about it in advance," the middle-grade officer explained. "But most of us count on a lifetime career in the foreign service."

STRUCTURAL PROBLEMS

In his speech, Mr. Kohler alluded to the feelings of many officers that the foreign affairs community, consisting of the several government agencies dealing with foreign affairs, could be better organized.

Privately, some middle-level State Department officials express frustration at their inability to exert the leadership role that they think the State Department should have. New board members say they would like to see the association come up with proposals for improving the situation.

THE PRESTIGE PROBLEMS

The underlying feeling, as one of the new board members put it, is that there is an unfair gap between the public view of the foreign affairs professionals and the feeling of the Foreign Service corps that they repre-

sent a highly qualified, well-educated, dedicated elite group of government servants.

This viewpoint was spelled out by six middle-level officers in a letter to the Foreign Service Journal in November, 1966. The letter was headed, "Are We Obsolete?" The Journal is the monthly publication of the association.

AUGUST 2, 1967.

HON. NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Under Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KATZENBACH: It occurred to me that now that you have been Under Secretary of State for some ten months, you might have had some second thoughts on my suggestion, made in a letter to the President last October, that a blue-ribbon Presidential commission be established to examine thoroughly the organization of not only the Foreign Service but all government agencies involved in the conduct of our foreign relations. I know that when I talked to you about this proposal last January you felt that you would prefer to undertake this task yourself. I can fully appreciate the fact that more pressing problems have prevented you from devoting your attention to this complicated matter; in fact, I was skeptical from the beginning that you would ever find the time to do so.

Since our talk, there have been several legislative proposals before the Committee relating to U.S.I.A. and A.I.D. personnel. The discussion of these measures showed clearly that there is a growing feeling in the Committee that the time has come to drop the piecemeal approach in favor of making a thorough study of this country's requirements, present resources and future needs with respect to personnel engaged in foreign affairs.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

U.S. SUPPORT OF U.N. SULLIED BY FAILURE TO RATIFY HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS—CIL

Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. President, the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] has been joined by a growing number of Senators in requesting United Nations action as a possible means of bringing peace and stability to Vietnam and Southeast Asia.

I welcome the majority leader's suggestion of an enlarged role of the United Nations in working toward a just and honorable peace in Vietnam.

I would also suggest that the support of the United Nations by the United States is somewhat suspect in view of this Nation's failure to ratify a single human rights convention. Our national failure to ratify any of these conventions stands in direct contradiction of our stated allegiance to the U.N.

Everyone is for human rights. The human rights conventions constitute an honest attempt to translate cherished human rights into international legal rights: to establish minimum universal standards of human dignity. The question can rightly be asked: "Just how much does the United States care about the work of the U.N. when the United States can ignore the Genocide Conventions for 18 years?"

This is a valid question and one which is not easily answered. Our unexplained failure to ratify any of these conventions embarrasses our allies and provides tons of propaganda for unfriendly nations.

The United States does not have to

take a back seat to any nation in human rights. I am proud of our Nation's continuing struggle to extend and guarantee human rights to every American citizen. Yet we have failed to ratify Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Freedom of Association, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery—treaties that guarantee freedoms which are already the birthright of every American.

I urge the Senate to reaffirm this Nation's support of the United Nations in a very meaningful way by giving our advice and consent to all the human rights conventions before us.

By so doing, we will put the United States squarely on record on the question of international human rights as well as give the United Nations a real lift when that world organization badly needs our endorsement.

THE NATURE OF OUR INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I have read with interest the remarks in the RECORD made yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] concerning the nature of our involvement in Vietnam.

The Senator has in his usually able fashion pointed out what is to me the single most important facet of our involvement there—the fact that our presence in Vietnam is welcomed by our Asian friends and the neighbors of South Vietnam. They welcome our involvement there because they realize, as Senator McGEE notes, that we are the wall—the umbrella—that shields them from Communist aggression.

As the Senator succinctly put it:

They do not want to be confronted by a new regime forced upon them by the mobilizing of terrorist groups from the outside. It is as simple and as elementary as that.

I agree. It is that simple. There has grown up around the entire question of Vietnam a body of nebulous charges as to who involved us in Vietnam, why we are involved in Vietnam, and the nature of our national interest in Vietnam. The remarks of Senator McGEE have helped to put the problem back in perspective.

In this same connection, I should like to recommend to the Senate an article written by the distinguished author Mr. Eugene Lyons, and published in the October issue of the Reader's Digest. In the article, Mr. Lyons quotes Senator McGEE as saying:

To understand Vietnam, it is necessary to understand that the issue is not Vietnam. Rather, it is the chance to achieve stability in all of Eastern Asia.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled, appropriately, "Vietnam: The Charges and the Facts," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM: THE CHARGES AND THE FACTS
(By Eugene Lyons)

(NOTE.—In Vietnam the United States is fighting a bloody war that has not been of-

ficially "declared" by Congress. Consequently there are none of the legal restraints on domestic dissent that prevail in wartime, and opponents of the military action have made the most of this situation. It is easy to overestimate the magnitude of the opposition because of its emotionalism and sheer decibel power. The fact is, nevertheless, that the majority of the American people, if polls are to be credited, support the war. But even among supporters the dissenters' arguments have generated confusion and skepticism. Here, then, are some of the critics' principal charges—and the hard facts that overwhelmingly refute them.)

Charge: "If we were not already involved as we are today in Vietnam, I would know no reason why we should wish to become so involved." George F. Kennan, former ambassador to Moscow and Belgrade, testified at Congressional hearings. Our policy makers, Sen. George McGovern of South Dakota wrote, "have distorted history to justify our intervention in a civil conflict." These claims imply that U.S. commitments to defend the life of South Vietnam were exaggerated and did not bind us to intervene with military force.

Fact: Through its adherence to SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization), the United States in 1954 pledged explicitly to use "appropriate means" (a diplomatic euphemism for military force) to meet any threat to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of South Vietnam. Thereafter, three successive Washington administrations consistently committed themselves to protect the national independence of that newborn nation, and economic and military aid to the Saigon government has been approved by Congress year after year.

The purpose of all this, as President Eisenhower explained to President Diem of South Vietnam in October 1954, was to assist in developing a "strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means." Six years later, Eisenhower again assured Diem that "for so long as our strength can be useful, the United States will continue to assist Vietnam in the difficult yet hopeful struggle ahead." President Kennedy reaffirmed this pledge in a letter to Diem on December 14, 1961, adding, "If the communist authorities in North Vietnam will stop their campaign to destroy the Republic of Vietnam, the measures we are taking to assist your defense efforts will no longer be necessary." The promise was sufficiently clear that if the campaign did continue, so would the American commitment to frustrate it.

In early August 1964, two U.S. destroyers were attacked by North Vietnamese torpedo boats in the international waters of the Gulf of Tonkin. Congress responded to this act of war at once. On August 7, it passed a joint resolution, with only two negative votes, authorizing the President to "take all necessary measures to prevent further aggression." The United States was prepared, it said, to use armed force "to assist any member or protocol state of SEATO requesting assistance in defense of its freedom." (South Vietnam, while not a member of the organization, is a "protocol state" under its protection.) That Congressional authorization remains in effect today.

Since then, of course, the record is replete with further official commitments to prevent the extinction of South Vietnam. At a White House press conference on July 28, 1965, for instance, President Johnson said, "We are in Vietnam to fulfill one of the most solemn pledges of the American nation. We cannot now dishonor our word or abandon our commitment or leave those who believed in us to the terror and repression and murder that would follow."

There may be room for dispute on the wisdom of the commitments and the actions taken to implement them, but not on their

compelling reality. Solemn obligations have been assumed at the highest levels of government and approved by Congress. In the course of the years, moreover, these commitments have acquired moral dimensions. Ever since 1954, American pronouncements have encouraged the South Vietnamese to persevere in resisting communism. To leave them now to the mercies of the enemy would be close to betrayal. American credibility and honor are clearly on the line in Vietnam.

Charge: The United States has no business being in Vietnam. In the words of Prof. Hans J. Morgenthau, "the war has no rational political purpose." We are acting, some critics say, through "a psychotic fear of communism," though communism has long ceased to be a real menace.

Fact: As far back as June 1, 1956, Sen. John F. Kennedy, at a conference of the American Friends of Vietnam in Washington, emphasized the great American stakes in Vietnam. "Vietnam," he stated, "represents the cornerstone of the free world in Southeast Asia, the keystone to the arch, the finger in the dike. Burma, Thailand, India, Japan, the Philippines, and obviously Laos and Cambodia would be threatened if the red tide of communism overflowed into Vietnam. The fundamental tenets of this nation's foreign policy, in short, depend in considerable measure upon a strong and free Vietnam."

Hanoi's conquest of South Vietnam could touch off a chain reaction of those "wars of liberation" which Red China and the U.S.S.R. equally have defined as their main technique for encircling and strangling the world of freedom. As Secretary of State Dean Rusk said on August 3, 1965, "If we were to fall in Vietnam, our adversaries would be encouraged to take greater risks elsewhere." Confirmation of this prospect comes constantly from the communists themselves. They candidly acknowledge that Vietnam is the test case for their liberation-war plans. "Within a short time," a delegate from North Vietnam declared at the Tricontinental Conference of world communism in Havana in 1966, "there will be not one but many Vietnams."

"To understand Vietnam," Sen. Gale McGee of Wyoming said at American University in Washington last June, "it is necessary to understand that the issue is not Vietnam. Rather, it is the chance to achieve stability in all of eastern Asia. What is happening along both sides of the 17th parallel might well have happened instead in the Philippines or in Thailand or Burma. It just happened to happen in Vietnam." And in his last recorded words, only half an hour before he died, Adlai Stevenson touched the heart of the matter. "My hope in Vietnam," he said, "is that resistance there may establish the fact that changes in Asia are not to be precipitated by outside forces."

Already the mere American presence in South Vietnam has raised the political morale in the small countries within the shadow of Red Chinese power. Those countries are showing new courage in tackling common social and economic problems through collective action. "If the Americans succeed in Vietnam," Thanat Khoman, Thailand's foreign minister, has declared, "there will be no second Vietnam, no third Vietnam." In the course of his recent American visit, Harold Holt, prime minister of Australia, told the press that American steadfastness in Southeast Asia had indirectly helped the defeat of communism in Indonesia.

Ugly and costly as the war has turned out to be, Vietnam was the right place and the right time to meet a life-and-death challenge in a critical part of our shrinking world. The argument that "we have no business" to be in Vietnam is a formula that opens wide the gates to aggressive communism—a virtual guarantee of bigger and more dangerous challenge elsewhere.

Charge: "While calling for negotiations,

we are practicing military escalation and diplomatic rigidity in such a fashion as to foreclose negotiations." This assertion by Senator McGovern reflects the fact that millions at home and abroad are honestly convinced that the United States has evaded peace talks. The demand that the United States "negotiate now" has been inscribed on myriad anti-war placards.

Fact: Never before in history has the stronger nation in a war pleaded so persistently with a weaker adversary for peace talks on almost any terms short of surrender, only to be repeatedly repulsed and insulted.

The State Department in late April made public an inventory of 28 proposals for talks made by the United States and intermediaries. An unofficial accounting by *U.S. News & World Report* placed the peace feelers between February '65 and March '67 at 45. But whatever the score, the common element in every case has been a firm rejection either by North Vietnam or by Red China in its behalf. Hanoi actually boasted that it had turned down the 28 U.S. peace initiatives listed by the State Department—five of them directly from the President—as mere "imperialist tricks." In these same years not a single direct feeler looking to negotiation or de-escalation of the conflict has come from North Vietnam.

In view of this record the continuing clamor for instant negotiations surpasses understanding. Strangely, the demands are directed not to reluctant Hanoi but to over-eager Washington. It is easy to understand the note of frustration in President Johnson's speech before the American Physical Society in April: "I want to negotiate. But I can't negotiate with myself."

At one point in 1964, it is true, the United States failed to respond to what U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations, reported as willingness by Hanoi to make contact with Americans in Rangoon, Burma. At that juncture the cards were so heavily stacked for the communists that few even among the so-called doves saw any sense in the meeting. The Vietcong was then at the peak of its victories and the Saigon government tottering; the American forces in Vietnam, still in an advisory role, were extremely minor. Negotiations then could only have been a cover for surrender.

Early in 1965, a more reasonable ratio of strength was attained. But at that point North Vietnam was indicating an impossible precondition for negotiation: the withdrawal of all American forces. Thereafter, when the United States began selective bombing, it switched to insistence upon permanent and unconditional cessation of that bombing, but without offering so much as a token move to match the American reduction in the level of fighting.

From that time forward, not only have the pressures for negotiations been entirely one-sided, but every American offer has been tailored to overcome previous communist objections. In an address in Baltimore on April 7, 1965, President Johnson consented to "unconditional discussions." Hanoi promptly denounced it as "a smoke screen to cover up the U.S. imperialists' military adventures in Vietnam." Then, when Hanoi charged that the U.S. was not willing to deal with North Vietnam's political arm in South Vietnam, the National Liberation Front, and its Vietcong terrorists, Washington made it clear that they would indeed be acceptable as partners to negotiation. Yet approaches to Hanoi, as well as Washington attempts to submit the issues to the U.N., have consistently been rebuffed.

On February 20, 1965, Britain proposed that Soviet Russia join her in seeking a settlement of the war. A spokesman for the NLF replied that first "the U.S. imperialists must withdraw all their troops." Ten weeks later, on April 1, seventeen nonaligned nations appealed for unconditional negotia-

tions. Washington approved their initiative, but again the reply was, in substance, "Nothing doing while American forces are in Vietnam."

During and after the Christmas truce in December 1965, the United States prolonged its cessation of bombing for 37 days. Against this background of unilateral restraint, it mounted a dramatic peace offensive. U.S. diplomatic envoys visited 34 capitals to seek support for negotiations, and the President addressed many heads of state to the same effect. U.N. Secretary General U Thant and dozens of governments begged Ho Chi Minh to agree to talks. Not only did Hanoi denounce all of it as "a large-scale deceptive peace campaign," but it raised the ante with a demand that the bombing be called off not merely unconditionally but permanently.

Then, in August 1966, the foreign ministers of Thailand, Malaysia and the Philippines sought an all-Asian effort to set talks in motion. They, too, were dismissed by Hanoi as "third-class henchmen of the United States" engaged in a "cheap farce." At the United Nations in the following month, Ambassador Arthur Goldberg offered the withdrawal of troops and a halt to bombing, and possible admission of the Vietcong to peace talks. The United States and six of its allies, meeting in Manila in October 1966, proposed a six-point plan for peace, which the communists at once condemned as "a swindle."

This is only a partial accounting. Hoping that North Vietnam might be more amenable to secret talks, Washington has made a number of unpublicized approaches. All in vain. If anything is clear it is that all possible paths to the conference table have been blocked not by Washington but by the communists.

Charge: U.S. bombing is the stumbling block on the path to peace. At an international *Pacem in Terris* conference in Geneva last May, the Rev. Martin Luther King called for an "end of all bombing of North Vietnam in the hope that such action will create the atmosphere for negotiations." A Canadian delegate, Chester A. Ronning, saw cessation of bombing as the first step toward "a dialogue among the parties to the conflict." "Stop the Bombing" is the No. 1 anti-war slogan.

Fact: On five occasions American bombing was halted as part of a holiday truce. In each instance Hanoi found excuses for evading peace talks. Instead it has exploited pauses to speed up its flow of supplies to the South. After the six-day cessation of bombing last February, for example, the Pentagon disclosed that the enemy had transported 23,000 tons of materials—"the largest resupply ever detected."

Under the circumstances Washington can hardly be blamed for resisting the demands for an unconditional and permanent end to bombing. American authorities have made plain that to bring about peace talks they are prepared to suspend bombing, provided Hanoi will suspend further infiltration of men and supplies into the South. They are urging, in substance, a freeze on the force levels of both sides, preferably with a ceasefire, but without one if necessary.

It should be obvious that, without such reciprocal action, the United States and its allies would face a constantly strengthened Vietcong as the hoped-for peace talks dragged on month after month. (It should not be forgotten that about one half of American casualties in Korea were sustained after the start of peace talks.) North Vietnam would again become a privileged sanctuary. And if obliged to resume air operations above the 17th parallel to stem the tide of enemy reinforcements, the United States would inevitably be accused by the whole world of disrupting the negotiations. These are the realities ignored by those who urge cessation of bombings and no questions

asked. Even columnist Walter Lippmann, a relentless opponent of American policy on Vietnam, concedes that to promise a permanent suspension of bombing would be an "absurdity." Yet the enemy will accept nothing else.

In a secret letter to Ho Chi Minh on February 2 of this year, President Johnson went close to the limit on this issue. "I am prepared," he wrote, "to order a cessation of bombing against your country and the stopping of further augmentation of United States forces in South Vietnam as soon as I am assured that infiltration into South Vietnam by land and by sea has stopped."

Ho's response, on February 15, accused the United States of "crimes against peace and against mankind." The United States, he said, "must cease this aggression, must stop unconditionally its bombing raids and all other acts of war." Only after that could his government "enter into talks."

In the light of such communist rigidity, only wishful thinking could justify another unconditional cessation. Surely, if Hanoi really had a change of mind, it is resourceful enough to convey that fact to Washington. The stakes are too high for another round in a murky guessing game.

Despite the clouds of confusion thrown around the issue, Hanoi knows it can get a cessation of American bombing at any time for the asking. The sole condition is a reduction in its own level of operations to match. This is not only reasonable but the least the United States can do to protect its own forces and those of its allies.

NEW YORK TIMES CALLS SPENDING CUT, NOT TAX HIKE, BEST ANTI-INFLATIONARY MEDICINE

Mr. PROXIMIRE. Mr. President, this morning's New York Times argues very persuasively that the tax hike proposed by the administration will not do the big anti-inflationary job that the administration says it will.

The Times points to the size of the tax increase—only about 1 percent of the gross national product—and also says that the tax might very well persuade corporations and labor to raise the price of what they sell.

I might add, Mr. President, that because the tax hike itself tends to slow down the economy and reduce income and jobs, it will yield far less than the amount the administration has indicated. Indeed, as some economists have told the Joint Economic Committee, it could have precisely the reverse effect of the 1964 tax cut which, in the view of most economists, actually increased revenues by increasing jobs and incomes.

Similarly, the 1967 tax hike could reduce, not increase, revenues and increase the size of the budget deficit.

Furthermore, as the New York Times has said, a spending cut can accomplish the same effect as a tax hike without the explicit inflationary impact of higher taxes contributing to higher prices. And, as the New York Times points out, there are plenty of places to cut without turning our backs on our social or international responsibilities.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Inflation Insurance," published in this morning's New York Times, be printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

INFLATION INSURANCE?

President Johnson's warning that his proposal for tax increases is essential if the hidden tax extorted by a future inflationary spiral is to be avoided overlooks the fact that the nation's consumers are already suffering the evil effects of inflation. This year's upsurge in prices, coming on top of the sharp rises of 1966, has shrunk consumer purchasing power and provoked organized labor's swollen wage demands.

Unfortunately, the President's proposal for a 10 per cent surcharge will do nothing now to halt the present wave of inflation. A tax increase might still be justified if it would really eliminate the threat of inflation in the future, but it is highly doubtful that Mr. Johnson's admittedly small request, averaging about 1 per cent of the present tax and providing only about \$7 billion in added revenues, is adequate for the purpose.

If the economic situation is as critical as Administration spokesmen say it is, this much of an increase in revenues is not going to be enough to curb inflationary price rises or prevent a fresh escalation in interest rates. Certainly it is too small to make much of a dent in a Federal budget deficit estimated to run from \$19 billion to \$29 billion. The surcharge might in fact prompt industry to raise prices in order to maintain profits and cause labor to press for even bigger wage increases. So instead of acting as a deterrent, it could be another spur to inflation.

A safer and surer way to guard against price rises is to reduce Federal spending that is not absolutely required to support the war in Vietnam and the fight against poverty. Mr. Johnson has observed that it took political courage to press for tax increases, but it would require even more courage to bring down spending by cuts in the Congressional pork barrel and other entrenched sources of waste and extravagance. By waging a fight for spending cuts, the President would not only lessen the threat of future inflation. He would also be doing something positive to cope with the inflation that is already here.

SELF-EVALUATION OF POVERTY PROGRAMS OF SHOSHONE AND ARAPAHOE TRIBES OF WIND RIVER RESERVATION, WYO.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, recently I received in the mail a rather concise self-evaluation of the poverty programs which are being carried on among members of the Shoshone and Arapahoe Indian Tribes on the Wind River Reservation of Wyoming. The overall community action program on the reservation is broad-based and popular and covers much ground, ranging from the publication of an excellent and informative newsletter to self-help housing. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report from Mr. J. C. Sollars, reservation director of the community action program.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOSHONE AND ARAPAHOE TRIBES,
Fort Washakie, Wyo., September 26, 1967.
Senator GALE McGEE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR McGEE: On July 11, 1967, the O.E.O. Committee met for the purpose of evaluating our existing O.E.O. Program, its components and allied activities.

These items included Conduct & Administration, Newsletter, Agricultural Extension, Head Start, NYC (Out of School, Summer & In School), Adult Basic Education, Upward Bound, Job Corps, Alcoholism, Legal

Aid, GSA Surplus Property, Educational Survey, Community Survey, Industrial Developments, Self Help Housing, Low Rent Housing, Rural Area Redevelopment Funds and MDTA Programs plus five VISTA workers.

This meeting lasted over four hours and persons responsible for each aspect gave a report and answered questions for the group.

The principal goal of our overall C.A.P. Program has been education and employment. Following this hearing it was moved and passed by a unanimous vote to recommend to the Shoshone and Arapahoe Joint Business Council that continual support be given to the O.E.O. Program. This recommendation was endorsed by a unanimous vote of the Shoshone and Arapahoe Joint Business Council the following week.

From an administrative position, it becomes difficult to rate one program over another so let me put them all together and list some details of each program.

All our employees have been hired locally except our professional employees: three Head Start teachers, one attorney and one director. We also have one Japanese employee, three rehabilitated employees, one alcoholic, one war veteran and one with a felony record. We further have one person who has been through a bankruptcy charge and two people who were previously on welfare. All of these employees are currently doing an excellent job for us. Our staff is composed largely of family people who are supporting 68 children.

We have had a waiting list for our NYC Program since it has been in operation. We have also had a waiting list for work stations which indicate how well the program has been received. Transportation has been a problem for us in a rural area. Our greatest pleasure from our NYC Program has come from the permanent job placement these young people have secured. Twelve NYC enrollees who were in this year's quota of 38 Out of School (drop outs) have returned to school. Six have found regular work, five have gone into the military service, two boys and one girl entered Job Corps, two enrollees went on job relocation and two were placed in MDTA Programs with several applications pending for the new Datel Training Program.

Our Legal Services is our newest component and we have had a very heavy workload for our attorney over the past eight weeks.

We are currently operating two Head Start centers with 60 children and we have requests and interest to establish a third center should funds be made available.

We have ten students in the University of Montana Upward Bound Program of which we are very proud. We have been trying to get a quota from the University of Wyoming as we have an additional 20 students who qualify and are interested.

Our Conduct and Administration Component, which administers all the programs listed, consists of a director, two assistant directors (one from each tribe) and one clerical person. With the exception of an assistant NYC Director, no other administrative personnel is employed.

We have contracted the firm of Raab-Raush & Gaymon to audit all our financial records under O.E.O. grants.

Our newsletter has been very well accepted and has proved very useful as shown by our Legal Services questionnaire which showed 70% of the people who used this service had gained their information from the newsletter.

This publication was so well accepted that the Joint Business Council agreed to finance additional copies for Service Men, Institutionalized tribal members and children away to schools.

We have completed an Educational Survey in conjunction with the new Junior College in Riverton. We conducted an Adult

Basic Education Program in English and Math for 13 people which ended in May. We also conducted a program under MDTA Funds for 30 heads of families. This program was completed in June.

Our Agricultural Extension Program includes home repair & construction, home management, consumer buying gardening, landscaping, cloth construction and home appliance use and care.

Our evaluation causes us to feel we are making good progress in our goals of education and employment. With better education or training, employment will increase and family income will be raised as a result. With an increase in income, living standards and personal motivation will also be raised.

In conclusion, on behalf of our O.E.O. Committee and the Shoshone and Arapahoe Joint Business Council, it has been our opinion based on the work of the Community Action Program during its first year, that it has been an excellent agency in helping to eliminate poverty on the Wind River Indian Reservation.

Sincerely,

J. C. SOLLARS,
Reservation Director, Community Action Program.

EXCESSIVE COST OF PHILADELPHIA EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT CORP.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on September 26, 1967, I spoke in support of the Emergency Employment Act. Throughout my statement I called attention to the need for proper implementation of that program if enacted. Indeed, we have all too often been in the position of seeing worthwhile programs by the somewhat less than inspiring level of their implementation. We would do well to consider the degree to which opponents of the Emergency Employment Act are influenced by situations such as that described in the following article from the Philadelphia Inquirer of September 17, 1967. The article details the fruitless efforts to obtain information about the Philadelphia Employment Development Corp. It is a sad story when the north Philadelphia area which most needs help has a program which lists \$1.8 million for staff salaries, travel, and expenses. Let me ask again the question asked in the article: Why is it going to take \$4.9 million and 480 persons for Philadelphia Employment Development Corp. to place 3,000 in jobs?

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIRECTOR SIDESTEPS QUESTIONS ON JOB (By Ward Welsh)

The new \$375-a-week director of a \$4.9 million program to find jobs for the poor in North Philadelphia said this week he thought his major problem would be "one of communication" with the public and private agencies.

Norman T. Russell, a 57-year-old North Jerseyite who has been in Philadelphia six weeks, knows what he is talking about.

For in a 45-minute interview with The Inquirer, he:

Clammed up when asked how the Philadelphia Employment Development Corporation's (PEDC) \$4.9 million in Federal funds would be spent, at first insisting it was "confidential information."

Refused to comment on Mayor James H. J. Tate's job-mobile program, even though the 500 persons it put to work for the city are being paid through Russell's office.

Could not recall when he had attended the University of Pennsylvania or Columbia University, although he noted both in his resume.

Russell, who had directed a training project for the National Committee on Employment of Youth in New York for about a year before coming here last month, will be coordinating the activities of six existing city agencies in an effort to find employment for about 3000 residents of North Philadelphia.

What makes Russell's PEDC different from other job development agencies is that Russell will be going after the real hard-core unemployed—those who have never been motivated even to apply for a job.

He'll be coordinating the efforts of the North City Congress, the Opportunities Industrialization Center, Urban League, Manpower Utilization Commission, Pennsylvania Bureau of Employment and Security and the Jewish Employment Vocational Service.

Richard Olanoff, director of the Manpower Utilization Commission, who outlined the program for *The Inquirer* after a fruitless interview with Russell, said Russell's program would be limited to the North Philadelphia area bounded by Vine st., Susquehanna ave., 5th st. and 25th sts.

Here are some excerpts from the Russell interview:

Q. Then you went to Penn?

A. Yes.

Q. What did you take at Penn?

A. Pre-med. I was interested in medicine then.

Q. What years were you there?

A. 1932. For two years. (Records indicate Russell attended Penn in 1930-31, as a pre-dental student.)

Q. Then you went to Columbia later?

A. Yes.

Q. When?

A. Ummm. I don't really remember. That's going back 30 years or so. (Columbia records indicate he attended the university in 1938-39.)

Q. Did you continue pre-med at Columbia?

A. No, I took business. I became interested in personnel (School records have Russell as an engineering student.)

That was the way it went.

Russell, who has two married daughters and a son, 12, said he'd rather not have it published that he and his wife live in Leonia, N. J.

Q. Why not?

A. Well, because that will be incorrect information.

Q. But you live there, don't you?

A. Just say I'm relocating.

"How is this \$4.9 million going to be spent?" Russell was asked.

"Well, it's all here in this budget," he said, picking up an inch-thick notebook from his desk.

"I'd like to look at it."

"Well, this is confidential information," Russell said.

He was told that the budget involved the expenditure of public funds and *The Inquirer* was interested in knowing where the \$4.9 million was going.

"I don't think it's necessary that you review my books," he said, looking at his watch to suggest time was up. "You'll have to get budget information from our auditors," he said. "I could meet you at the accountant's on Monday."

"But you are the executive director of this program. I presume you can give me some idea how you are going to spend this money," he was pressed.

"Awfully sorry, but I'm so busy," Russell said graciously.

"I want you to get the right interpretation of the budget," he said.

"I'm not interested in interpretation. I just want to see the figures."

"Well, what do you want, everything down to the last dollar?" Russell said, restarting an earlier merry-go-round.

"No, maybe you could break it down into \$500,000 blocks."

"Oh, no, it can't be broken down that way."

In an effort to make up for wasted time, the interviewer asked Russell what the real "gut-problems" of his job-finding effort were going to be.

He reeled off something about "recruitment . . . two weeks' orientation . . . see if they're ready for placement . . . skill training . . . placed in OJT situation."

But hadn't Mayor Tate's jobmobile drive already placed several hundred hardcore unemployed in jobs in recent weeks?

"No comment," Russell blurted.

"Well, I mean, you must be familiar with what's been going on here in this field," this reporter said.

"I only know what I read in the papers," Russell said. "I can only speak about PEDC." (Olanoff said later the 500 persons employed by the city in the jobmobile program are being paid with PEDC funds, through Russell.)

Russell finally agreed to show *The Inquirer* one page of his budget. It showed \$1.7 million allocated for recruitment and enrollment, \$1.8 million for staff salaries, travel, and expenses, and \$914,000 for operations, including \$423,000 for "training."

"You'll have to hurry," Russell said, as the reporter scanned the complex page of figures, taking notes.

"Could I look at the figures in your secretary's office so I won't hold you up?"

"No," Russell said.

Olanoff said the Mayor's program had placed 2100 persons in jobs in the last six weeks and that indications are that about 1800 of those are still working.

Then why is it going to take \$4.9 million and 480 persons for PEDC to place 3000 in jobs.

"Well, Russell is going after the people who have given up, who won't even come out if a job is offered them," Olanoff said. "They're at the bottom of the barrel. They don't want jobs."

ASKING HO TO BEG FOR MERCY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President the latest pronouncement of President Johnson on the war in Vietnam took no new ground in the arena of possible peace negotiations. I had hoped that this might be an occasion on which we would hear an important announcement—it was even my hope that the time had come when the President would decide to halt the bombing of the north unilaterally and wait for the overtures we have so often been told would be forthcoming in due course if we should do so. Instead, the reiteration of a demand for assurances in advance results again, predictably, in no response from Hanoi.

Carl T. Rowan has put the situation into this summary sentence:

To ask Hanoi publicly to pledge peace talks if the United States stops the bombing is equivalent to asking Ho to beg for mercy in front of the whole world. It just isn't going to happen.

Mr. Rowan, in the column from which that quotation is taken, discusses not only the realities of the approach but the reactions of the public, particularly as seen in a discussion with college students and faculty. Most, he found, be-

lieve that in spite of our peace protestations "President Johnson really wants to solve the Vietnam war only by giving the Communists a military drubbing."

Whether the conclusion is valid or not, the truth is that this interpretation is a most central factor in the credibility gap. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Rowan's column, published in the *Washington Star*, be printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

ON CLOSING THE CREDIBILITY GAP

(By Carl T. Rowan)

WEST CHESTER, Pa.—"I'm convinced that Lyndon Johnson will settle only for complete surrender by Ho Chi Minh and the Communists," the young professor said. "I'm convinced that no other end to the Vietnam war is acceptable to him."

I looked down the dinner table as a couple of students at West Chester State College nodded weakly, as if inclined to agree, but not quite sure.

"But how does that make sense," I asked, "when you have just told me what a totally politically animal Lyndon Johnson is? And when you have said Johnson is in deep political trouble because of this war?"

"Wouldn't logic suggest that a politically sensitive President, desiring re-election, would want out of this war almost as much as he wants to breathe?"

This led to a discussion of the recent controversy over the claim by former editor Harry Ashmore that the President undercut a major peace effort by Ashmore and Miami editor William Bageby by dispatching a tough letter to Ho. There was talk of other alleged "peace rejections" by Washington.

Then a couple of dinner guests chimed in with comments that "Johnson is in an impossible dilemma"—that however badly he wants peace in Vietnam, he must get it on terms good enough to prevent the Republicans from filling the 1968 campaign with charges that the Democrats are "soft on communism."

When the talking was all done, it was clear that most of the people at that dinner believed President Johnson really wants to solve the Vietnam war only by giving the Communists a military drubbing.

This I found both surprising and disturbing, particularly in view of the fact that only hours earlier Ambassador to the U.N. Arthur Goldberg had said to the U.N. General Assembly:

"... This conflict can and should be ended by a political solution at the earliest possible time. A military solution is not the answer. For our part, we do not seek to impose a military solution on North Vietnam or on its adherents. By the same token, in fidelity to a political solution, we will not permit North Vietnam and its adherents to impose a military solution upon South Vietnam."

These students and faculty members to whom I talked at dinner were no wild-eyed placard bearers, no irrational demonstrators. They were just ordinary Americans troubled, confused, looking for help in staking out an area of true belief—and not finding enough help from their government.

It seems to me that there is a lesson in their suspecting the worst about their President and their government—even in the face of those pretty plain words by Goldberg. That lesson is that, if Americans found the Goldberg speech unconvincing, so did foreigners at the United Nations and the decision-makers in Hanoi, Moscow, Peking.

The truth is that millions of Americans have come to think that the United States plays the game of foreign relations the same

way the Russians do: That we talk one track, even as we roll resolutely down another.

The people seem to think that, with deliberate cynicism, we talk peace even while delivering death in ever-larger doses.

Thus, it is easy even for Americans to believe that Goldberg could deliver his peace appeal, for propaganda effect, with a certain knowledge that Hanoi would reject it. And this rejection would become justification enough for further escalation of the bombing of North Vietnam.

Well, there surely was no doubt in the White House or State Department that Hanoi would respond negatively. To ask Hanoi publicly to pledge peace talks if the United States stops the bombing is equivalent to asking Ho to beg for mercy in front of the whole world. It just isn't going to happen.

I said months ago that if the United States stopped the bombing without any implied threats—or promises—we would get a real clue as to whether a political solution is possible. I said we could make our next moves in good conscience once we had made an honest, bold move that many wise men say is the absolute key to peace. I said that the potential benefits far outweigh the potential dangers. I still believe this.

A major potential benefit might be restoration of the credibility of the President and of the United States government among people like those I saw here. And that is a benefit not to be passed over lightly.

FISCAL 1968 AND REDUCING FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, we are in a period when it is essential to the economy, to the people, and to the country that Government exercise restraint and good judgment in Federal spending.

In fiscal year 1968 we face a possible budget deficit of \$30 billion. With the war in Vietnam, the likelihood of an even higher deficit is undeniable, and the people here at home are facing an even more inflated market. Each wage increase is lost in the spiral of price increases, and the consumer is questioning the administration's demand for a 10-percent tax increase.

In an effort to ease the economy, the administration has announced it will cut all nonessential spending possible. In 1966, the administration sought to reduce expenditures in the fiscal 1967 budget. President Johnson told Congress:

We intend to reduce or eliminate every possible federal expenditure provided in (the 1967 fiscal appropriations) consistent with the well-being of our citizens . . .

Just last month the President sent another message to Congress concerning the 1968 appropriations. He said:

The executive branch pledges to take every proper action within its power to reduce expenditures in the January budget . . .

He continued:

I pledge to the country and the Congress that I will make every possible expenditure reduction—civilian and military—short of jeopardizing the Nation's security and well being.

Secretary of the Treasury Fowler echoed the President's promise before the House Ways and Means Committee on August 14, when he said:

This program includes both tax measures to increase our revenues and action by the Congress and the Executive Branch to restrain, cut and control expenditures so as to

reduce the prospective deficit on fiscal 1968 and thereafter to manageable levels.

I appear today to ask for taxing authority for the same purpose and to plead through this Committee to the Congress that it join with the President in making every possible expenditure reduction—civilian and military—short of jeopardizing the nation's security and well being.

I agree with the intent of the administration, but question its actions. From what I have seen in the past few weeks, the requests and promises of the administration are a veneer of words. They have called for a cut in Federal spending, yet they act to the contrary. When the chips are down, few stand on the side of reducing Federal expenditures. But now, of all times, is when we need to face the reality of our fiscal spending. Now is when we must cease our constant increasing of Federal expenditures and, if not reduce them substantially, at least hold the line at the present level.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Last week the Senate considered the Independent Offices appropriation bill. As approved by the House, the bill contained \$10 billion. This amount was \$435 million more than the \$9.5 billion appropriated in 1967 for the same agencies. The figure sent to us from the House was a substantial increase over last year, yet was \$807 million under the administration's estimated budget for fiscal 1968. To the appropriation sent over from the House, the Senate reported the bill out of committee with an increase of \$446 million, making the total appropriation more than \$10.8 billion.

When the estimated participation sales are added to the Senate's recommendation, the money available to the offices and agencies for spending increases by \$3.3 billion over fiscal 1967, rather than the \$880 million figure of actual appropriations. The amount of increase over the House appropriation similarly expands from \$446 million in actual appropriations to \$2.8 billion with the addition of the participation sales.

Collectively, I supported the total bill, since the offices and agencies involved perform vital functions within the governmental structure. But as I mentioned earlier, this is a time to hold the line on continued increase in spending. I cannot see unlimited appropriation for each and every office and agency of the Government when our task as responsible legislators is to protect the economy and provide sound fiscal policy. If we must cut spending, why not now? When is there a better time to start?

The consideration of the Independent Offices appropriation bill was an excellent time for the Senate to begin cutting nonessential items from the budget. Nothing in that bill was an essential military expenditure; therefore, it was right to review and question any item. Yet when questions were raised on the floor and record votes were called to reduce spending, they were defeated by 2-to-1 margins. The reductions, if approved, would have decreased Federal spending authority by \$3.5 billion—including participation sales—but not one of the proposed reductions passed. As shown by the record I supported the reductions and opposed the increases.

THE 1968 OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY BILL

Having reminisced the activities of last week, I find we stand at the same familiar crossroads again. Our attention is now on the appropriations for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In fiscal year 1967, the original appropriation for that Office was \$1.6 billion, to which a later supplement of \$75 million was added. The OEO thus received \$1.7 billion for that fiscal year.

The original plan for fiscal 1968 called for an appropriation of \$2.258 billion. This represents an increase of \$570.5 million over last year. Now, as we consider this request for appropriations, a call is made not to reduce the level of spending, but to increase the appropriation by more than twice as much. An amendment to add \$2.8 billion to the original appropriation request is made by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. This additional sum would boost the total OEO appropriation to more than \$5 billion, which is more than three times the fiscal 1967 appropriation.

If our need to cut Federal spending is as necessary and imperative to the economy as the administration and its advisers indicate, then how can we in good conscience allow appropriations of such magnitude and increase to be authorized? If we must act to help the economy, let us act now, before we create conditions which will require our future attention and action to eliminate.

Frankly, Mr. President, my concern is that this administration not only has spent money it has not got yet; it has spent money it is not going to get either.

CHAIN DRUGGISTS MOVING TO GENERIC PRESCRIPTIONS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am happy to be able to say that recognition of the importance of generic drugs in making dramatic savings—and still affording the consumer the excellent care to which we have all become accustomed—is becoming an accepted fact.

Just recently, two large drug store chains announced that they are going to maintain complete inventories of generic drugs. Soon in two of the Nation's largest cities, whenever a doctor prescribes generically, he can be assured that the prescription will be filled with a high quality, low cost generic drug.

Peoples Drug Stores, Washington, D.C., a chain of 241 stores representing \$154 million in gross annual sales, filled 7 million prescriptions in 1966. In a letter written to 5,000 area doctors, Peoples announced that they are dropping their brand-name policy.

From now on—

They said—

should doctors choose to prescribe by generic name, the (your) prescriptions will be welcome and will be filled with quality drugs at competitive generic prices.

The choice still remains with the doctor to choose whichever drug he wishes.

In a full page newspaper ad in the Cleveland Press, Gray Drug Stores preceded People's change in policy by announcing that it was taking steps to

carry a full line of generic drugs for those medical doctors who "would like to save their patients money."

In supplementary letters to the doctors of the area, Gray, whose 173 stores grossed \$83 million and filled 4 million prescriptions in 1966, ranking them number five in order of size in the country, said M.D.'s "can prescribe generic drugs with confidence that they will be products of a reliable manufacturer."

The ad stressed the 133 years' experience of the generic manufacturer who will supply Gray, and added that along with the use of the professional fee, the generic prescription would cost "less than half of the price of equivalent 'brand name' drugs."

Gray intends to expand its generic policy into other cities shortly. Neither drug chain so far has reported any opposition by the doctors.

As a matter of fact, both actions by these two large mercantile establishments merely endorses the policy of the American Medical Association which is in favor of "quality drugs at lowest possible price," leaving the choice to the doctor.

It is interesting to note in Gray's advertisement that the particular generic drug manufacturer Gray will be buying from also manufactures "brand name drugs" for many of the best known pharmaceutical firms in the country—a point stressed by several witnesses who have appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly.

I feel that this dramatic policy change to generic prescriptions by two of the largest drug chains in the country, representing more than 400 stores and \$230 million in gross annual sales, and filling over 11 million prescriptions per year, is a major breakthrough in knocking down ridiculous prejudices against quality generic drugs.

No level-headed businessman is going to jeopardize his business by trying to sell faulty drugs. Peoples and Gray have built huge businesses based on public confidence and favorable prices.

I anticipate that other drug retailers and community pharmacists will soon follow suit and that the consumers' demand for better drug buys will soon bear fruit.

If millions of dollars a year can be saved for the American patient by the use of high quality, inexpensive, generic drugs—as I am confident will be demonstrated by these two chain druggists alone—then the committee will be amply rewarded for its efforts.

MODINE BEGINS ANOTHER 50 YEARS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Modine Co., of Racine, Wis., is to be congratulated for becoming the Nation's leader in keeping industry cool.

In 50 years, Modine has grown to a work force of 2,500 persons, nine plants, and \$59 million in annual sales.

The company is the largest independent manufacturer of radiators and oil coolers for engines. It is an industrial leader in building specialized heat ex-

changers, institutional heating, air conditioning, and ventilating systems.

Modine has achieved a major breakthrough in technology by developing a thermochemical process for bonding aluminum components into an integral heat exchanger structure.

I ask unanimous consent that an article describing Modine and its achievements published in a recent issue of the Wisconsin Business News magazine, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEPING INDUSTRY COOL FOR 50 YEARS

It's a little over 50 years since Arthur B. Modine started out with a handful of employees, a small rented space and a firm belief in an idea . . . the right way to cool an engine.

Today Modine, an acknowledged leader in its industry, has a work force in excess of 2500 operating nine plants producing and selling 59 million dollars worth of products in the past year.

Progress from the Spirex radiator (above left) to today's ultra modern and highly diverse devices has been accomplished through a series of research developments that has seen Modine grow to the largest independent manufacturer of engine cooling products for the O.E.M. market, supplying radiators and oil coolers to major producers of agricultural and earth-moving machinery, trucks, buses and passenger cars. The company also builds specialized heat exchangers for air compressors, electric generating sets, stationary power plants and hydraulic systems.

Additional, and entirely different, markets are served by Modine heating, ventilating, air conditioning and air handling equipment designed for human comfort. Typical of these products are unit heaters, fan-coil air conditioners, unit ventilators, central station air handlers and make-up air units. Primary markets for this product group are factories, schools, hospitals, commercial buildings and apartments.

Typical of Modine's policy of progress through research is the development of Alfuse. Alfuse, one of many Modine patents, is a thermochemical process for bonding aluminum components into an integral heat exchanger structure. Ten years in development Alfuse has proved to be a revolutionary advance in new high-production aluminum fabricating wherein the bonding achieved through the process is so superior that the resultant bonds are actually stronger than the parent metal itself.

A NEW CONCEPT IN ALUMINUM EXCHANGER DESIGN

Application of the Alfuse bonding process to heat exchanger fabrication permitted Modine to develop a new type of coil having special performance, durability and application advantages. The new design concept offered engineers far greater flexibility in adapting condensers and evaporators to their end products.

This major difference between standard round-tube, plate-fin coil construction and the new Modine process is that Alfuse coils are aluminum extrusions which incorporate internal struts and finning for greater heat transfer. In addition to being relatively inexpensive, it is possible to fabricate extruded tubes in a variety of shapes at moderate tooling costs. And since each coil has a single continuous serpentine tube with a brazed inlet and outlet at either end, the potential for leaks is minimal when compared with conventional coils having from ten to a hundred brazed tube joints.

The secondary heat transfer surface is made up of a type of serpentine air fins

which have long been used successfully in automotive radiator designs.

After assembly, tubes and fins are completely bonded by the Alfuse process into a solid structure. The Alfuse process, in addition to producing an extremely rugged coil, has several side benefits. For example, alloying which takes place during the process, serves to harden the aluminum fins. And because the Alfuse process metallurgically bonds fins to tubes . . . as opposed to the mechanical bonding used in conventional coils . . . gradual deterioration of the fin-tube joint and subsequent loss of heat transfer capacity over a period of time are eliminated. Experimental condensers installed on cars in 1956 now have 180,000 miles of service and have retained their original heat transfer performance.

DESIGN FLEXIBILITY SOLVES PROBLEMS

Designers of air conditioning and refrigeration equipment have found Alfuse coils of particular value in solving critical problems created by space, weight and configuration of the required heat exchangers. Recognizing the need for coils of a predetermined capacity, their efforts to achieve new styling concepts have been hampered by the bulk and shape of the standard coils previously available to them.

Because Alfuse coils can be formed into a variety of shapes ranging from a figure 8 to a complete circle, they do not restrict the creative ideas of the designer.

Greater heat transfer capacity in a given space . . . or the same cooling capacity in less space offers further design and styling flexibility.

Esthetically, Alfuse coils are pleasing to the appearance when painted in colors to match or contrast with the end product. Therefore, they can be used for both decorative and functional purposes.

Alfuse represents one of the longest and most complex development projects ever undertaken by Modine. Entirely new and untried manufacturing techniques had to be developed and perfected. New manufacturing facilities had to be designed and built in order to apply the process for high production. Existing laboratories and research required substantial expansion with increased emphasis on thermochemistry. Testing procedures under aggressive environmental conditions were developed, involving product life tests in the field and in the laboratory extending up to six years. A new plant specifically devoted to aluminum products was built to separate the processes required to produce aluminum products from those required for the company's other copper, copper-aluminum, brass and steel products. This plant has since been expanded three times to accommodate the increasing aluminum product volume.

In all of these activities, Modine ran into many blind alleys and headaches, some of which proved extremely costly in time and money. Organic chemistry of the highest order has had to be employed.

Further development of the Alfuse process and product design continues in Modine laboratories, on its drafting boards and in its manufacturing facilities. Currently, another complete plant for Alfuse manufacturing is being constructed.

The dollars Modine has spent and continues to spend in process and product research and development and the required additional personnel and manufacturing facilities are a sound investment . . . even to the ever-watchful controller.

McGRAW-HILL ECONOMICS VICE PRESIDENT OPPOSES A SURTAX NOW

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, one of the most respected corporations dealing

with the affairs of the business world is McGraw-Hill, Inc., to whose business publications leaders of the economy look for guidance with the greatest of respect.

It is therefore especially significant that the corporation's vice president for economics, Dr. Gordon W. McKinley, has added his voice to those of economists who fail to see wisdom in the surtax proposal in view of the current economic situation.

Dr. McKinley finds that there has been "a serious lack of careful economic analysis in connection with the timing and size of the tax increase." He believes that a 10-percent surtax could be, as I have stated repeatedly, self-defeating under the circumstances—that it "could bring about a smaller output of goods and services, a lesser revenue to the Treasury, and a greater deficit in the Federal budget."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. McKinley's views, as set forth in a speech made by him in Cincinnati on September 19, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BUSINESS OUTLOOK AND NATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY IN 1968

(Address by Gordon W. McKinley, Vice President, Economics, McGraw-Hill, Inc., before the seventh annual distribution conference, sponsored by the American Supply and Machinery Manufacturers' Association, in Cincinnati, Ohio, September 19, 1967)

There are three questions which I should like to discuss with you today: First, is the Johnson Administration correct in believing that business activity will surge ahead very strongly in the closing months of this year? Second, should Congress enact the proposed surtax on corporate and personal incomes? Third, what is likely to happen to business activity in 1968?

During the past year and a half, the American economy has been subjected to stresses and strains of tremendous magnitude. The most obvious of these has been the sharp redirection of economic activity caused by the huge increase in Government expenditures. From the beginning of 1966 to the middle of 1967, spending by the Federal Government has jumped by \$20 billion, and spending by the state and local governments has increased by \$14 billion. In this short space of time all forms of government have called on the economy to divert an extra \$34 billion of goods and services to defense and other public needs.

Government has also been responsible for severe stresses imposed through fiscal and monetary channels. The great swing in Federal Reserve policy, from moderate ease at the end of 1965 to an almost unprecedented degree of tightness in the autumn of 1966, had its most obvious casualty in the housing industry but the remainder of the economy did not by any means escape unharmed. In the field of fiscal policy, the suspension of the investment tax incentives in October, 1966 and their hurried restoration in 1967 produced a completely unnecessary hiatus in investment plans as well as administering a sudden and ill-timed shock to the economy as a whole.

In addition to these strains imposed by Government, the economy in 1966 and 1967 has struggled through a huge inventory adjustment and a period of unusually cautious consumer behavior. From the spring of 1966 to the spring of 1967, consumers retreated into their shells, saved a very high propor-

tion of their incomes, and appeared disinterested in durable goods of any kind. Retail sales simply leveled off for an entire year. Partly as a result of the leveling in consumer purchases and partly as a result of the enforced downturn in capital expenditures, inventories increased in the final quarter of 1966 by an all-time record annual rate of \$18.5 billion. The attempt to work off these huge inventories, at a time when consumers were reluctant to buy, when capital spending was falling, and when housing had been cut to a very low point naturally exerted a tremendous depressant force on production during the opening months of this year.

The stresses and strains which I have been describing could hardly fail to have left their mark on the economy. If economic systems could have nervous breakdowns, certainly the American economy should have had such a breakdown during the last year and a half as it was buffeted by conflicting forces, private and government, and twisted this way and that by demands for greater output here, and less output there.

As we know, our economic system in the opening months of this year did exhibit some of the symptoms of an incipient breakdown. In the first quarter, national output rose by only 0.6 per cent, and when allowance is made for price increases, real national output actually fell slightly. In the second quarter, output gained 1.1 per cent, but this was still below par. Reflecting the slow growth in output, unemployment has risen slightly, overtime has been cut, real weekly earnings in manufacturing have slipped, and corporate profits have turned down.

But despite these unfavorable developments, the really surprising thing is that the economy was able to stand up as well as it did under the tremendous stresses placed upon it. Despite the slowing in the pace of business activity, the fact is that economy did grow, it did not fall into a recession, it did make the unusual adjustments required of it, and at mid-year was once again beginning to exhibit its characteristic resiliency.

There is no question that the economy is now gathering speed and strength. The automobile strike has introduced an element of uncertainty, but the economic indicators are nevertheless rising. Manufacturers' new orders have exceeded shipments in each of the past three months, and order backlogs are rising. Retail sales in the most recent six months have risen by 6 per cent, an exceptionally rapid gain. The drop in corporate profits appears to have been arrested, and personal incomes are rising more rapidly. Housing starts have regained almost all of the loss suffered in 1966, and nonresidential contracts are signaling a rise in commercial and manufacturing construction. The money supply is increasing at an above-average pace, and individual savings are at record levels. The inventory correction has now proceeded to the stage where the downward pressure on production will be relieved; a small accumulation of inventories is likely to occur in the closing months of this year.

My guess is that national output is now running at an annual rate of \$792 billion, and will surge forward to an \$810 billion pace in the closing quarter of this year. Gross national product for the full year 1967 is likely to exceed \$785 billion, a good increase of almost 6 per cent over 1966—particularly good in the light of the poor performance early in the year. In other words, I believe that the Administration is correct in anticipating a strong recovery in the closing months of this year.

THE PROPOSED TAX INCREASE

Now let's move on to the second question—Should Congress enact the proposed surtax on corporate and personal incomes?

Because of the huge deficit in prospect for the Federal budget and because of the strain that deficit might impose on the capi-

tal markets, some increases in taxes is probably unavoidable in the year ahead. But there has unfortunately been a serious lack of careful economic analysis in connection with the timing and the size of the tax increase. As a result, the surtax proposed by the Administration is both too much and too soon.

The Administration has argued that there is an immediate need for a substantial tax increase because the total demands on the American economy will in the near future outstrip the maximum capacity of our productive resources. Government economists have painted a picture of an economy so fully employed that excessive demand will result in serious inflation. They have argued that a substantial tax increase is needed to curb demand and hold inflation in check.

Is this an accurate picture of the American economy today, or several months from today? I do not believe so. At present, our manufacturing industries are operating on the average at 83.5 per cent of capacity, unemployment is higher than a year ago, and there is little resort to overtime. Even if the recovery over the rest of this year is fully as strong as the Administration has predicted, it will nevertheless be true that there will be a great deal of slack left in the system. Real output in the closing months of this year may rise as much as 3 per cent, but industrial capacity in the United States is also growing steadily and rapidly. For this reason, even a sharp increase in output will raise the operating rate to only 85 per cent of capacity by the end of this year. This is far below maximum capacity and well below the preferred, or most efficient, operating rate of 91 per cent. To put it briefly, at the end of this year there will be no strain on manufacturing capacity and no economic reason for a tax designed to curb demand for manufactured products. Furthermore, it is difficult to conjure up a threat of any materials shortages, and quite obviously the economy will not be short of inventories on hand.

It might be argued, however, that although goods will be plentiful and productive capacity will be ample, there may be a shortage of labor. Again, the argument is unconvincing. There are almost always shortages of highly skilled and particularly able workers, but the contention that we are approaching a general shortage of workers just does not stand up under examination. The labor supply at present is increasing rapidly, and the number of hours worked per week can be increased by almost 2 per cent without exceeding the 1966 average. The increase in output expected over the rest of this year is likely to be accomplished simply by absorbing most of the growth in the labor force and by returning workers who are now on part-time to a full-time schedule.

It thus seems reasonable to conclude that at the end of this year neither our resources of plant nor our resources of labor will be strained by the expected rise in output. There will still be considerable slack in productive capacity, there will be few materials shortages, there will be abundant inventories, and there will be an adequate supply of labor.

Under these circumstances, an increase in taxes before the end of the year would be self-defeating. Even by the beginning of 1968, a tax increase will not be needed to curb demand. A small increase at that time will perhaps be necessary in order to lessen the burden imposed on the capital market by large Treasury borrowing, but even this argument appears a bit strained, depending as it does on the assumption that the Federal Reserve would permit a sharp tightening in the capital markets at a time when manufacturing industries are operating at only 85 per cent of capacity.

Fortunately, Congress does not seem in a mood to be rushed on the tax question. The

legislators will show good judgment if they defer action on the tax bill until the economic trend is clearer than it is today. As that trend unfolds I believe that it will indicate that the surtax should not exceed 5 per cent, that it should be applied equally to corporate and personal tax liabilities, and the effective date should not be prior to January 1, 1968.

DEMANDS ON THE ECONOMY IN 1968

Now let's turn to the final question—Assuming a 5 per cent surtax effective January 1, how well is the economy likely to perform in 1968?

I think the year will be good, but not exuberant. I seriously doubt that at any time during the year the economy will be pushed to its maximum capability. Here are the main demand segments which I believe will join to produce a moderately prosperous year for 1968—

Government Spending. First, government spending. In 1968, government purchases of goods and services will rise rapidly, but not as rapidly as in either 1966 or 1967. State and local government spending will continue its steady upward climb, and expenditures of the Federal Government will expand by about two-thirds as much as in 1967. By the fourth quarter of 1968, total purchases by all forms of government will reach a \$200 billion annual rate, accounting for 23.5 per cent of total GNP. The increase of \$16 billion in government expenditures in 1968 will be a principal force driving the economy upward.

Inventories. A second force, which can on occasion exert a strong impact on national output, is business inventory policy. During the past year, inventory policy has fluctuated widely, from the final quarter of 1966 when total business inventories in the United States were growing at an \$18.5 billion annual rate, to the middle of 1967 when inventories were falling slightly, and now back to a policy of moderate inventory accumulation.

In the first half of 1968, the rate of inventory accumulation will be speeded up, and this will stimulate increased production. Part of this rise in stocks on hand will be a natural rebound from the cautious policy of 1967. In addition, there will be stockpiling of steel in the first half of 1968 as a hedge against a possible strike in that industry following the termination of the wage contract in July. In the last half of next year, however, the subsequent rundown of steel inventories will exert some dampening effect. For the year as a whole, inventories will constitute a mildly buoyant factor calling for an increase in national output of about \$3 billion.

Housing. A third force which will provide a steady, though modest, addition to national output in 1968 will be residential construction. Housing has recovered well this year, rising from an annual rate of only 880,000 units in October, 1966 to almost 1,400,000 at present. In 1968, there is no question that the underlying demand for housing will be strong. The number of young people coming to the age when they are likely to establish separate living quarters is exceptionally large. Marriages have been rising steadily in the past several years. More and more single persons, both young and old, are able to afford separate living quarters. The inventory of unoccupied housing units has declined sharply over the past year, and rental vacancy rates for the nation as a whole are lower than at any time since 1959.

The principal doubt about housing in 1968 does not arise from a lack of demand, but rather from the possibility of a lack of mortgage money. With the 1966 tight money experience fresh in mind, many economists have pointed out that, if open market interest rates in 1968 are permitted to rise much above their current level, funds could once again flow out of the mortgage market and the housing industry could once again

be brought to its knees through a lack of financing.

Such a development could occur but I do not believe it is likely. The situation facing the Federal Reserve in 1968 will be quite different from that in 1966. On that occasion, both financial and nonfinancial corporations were starved for liquidity, whereas the economy will enter 1968 in a fairly liquid position. In 1966, manufacturing industries were operating at better than 90 per cent of capacity, whereas the operating rate in the opening months of 1968 will be about 85 per cent. In 1966, the growth in government spending was accelerating, whereas in 1968 it will be slowing. In 1966, inventories were piling up at a record pace, whereas in 1968 inventory accumulation will be moderate.

For these reasons, I believe that a tight money policy in 1968 would be unjustified and unsound. The fear of a new credit squeeze is likely to prove unfounded. Mortgage money should remain sufficiently plentiful next year to permit a rise in housing starts to a 1,500,000 unit level. Residential construction expenditures are likely to rise in 1968 by about \$2 billion—not a tremendous increase when matched against the capacity of the construction industry, but nevertheless one which will provide the housing we need as well as contributing to the rise in overall business activity.

Business Capital Spending. Now let's turn to the fourth major segment of the economy in 1968—the broad area encompassed by what are usually called the capital goods industries.

Business expenditures on plant and equipment are at present slowly recovering from the unfortunate effect of the suspension of the investment tax incentives. From a peak annual rate of \$83 billion in the closing months of 1966, capital spending dropped to an \$81.5 billion rate in the second quarter of this year. Following the restoration of the incentives, new orders for durable goods rose in May, June, and July, and deliveries of capital goods have now begun to increase. By the fourth quarter of this year, the pace of business capital expenditures will probably have moved back to an \$83 billion rate. There will thus have been no growth in capital expenditures during 1967, a strong contrast to the average 15 per cent growth in the two preceding years.

I would like very much to say that in 1968 business capital expenditures are due for a new and tremendous spurt upward. I would like to make that prediction because America's economic strength, its ability to wage both the battles of war and of peace, and its ability to avert inflation, all depend on the quantity and the quality of the capital equipment.

The evidence, however, suggests that although plant and equipment expenditures will rise next year the increase will be quite moderate. It will be moderate: *first*, because the downturn in profits in 1967 has limited the funds available for fixed investment; *second*, because even a small surtax imposed on top of corporate tax liabilities will further limit investable funds; *third*, because the dominance of Government as a buyer, along with the restriction of consumer expenditures through higher taxes, limits the growth of the peacetime economy and the industries serving the peacetime economy; *finally*, because the economy in 1968, contrary to the predictions of the Administration in Washington, is not likely to operate at so high a percentage of capacity as to encourage extraordinary capital investment.

My guess is that plant and equipment expenditures will increase from an \$83 billion rate in the closing months of this year to about \$88 billion in the fourth quarter of 1968, a rise of 6 per cent.

Consumer Purchases. The final main buying segment which will determine the course of the economy in 1968 is that presided over by the consumer.

Fortunately for the business outlook, consumer spending now appears to be on the upswing of a cycle. Following the caution of late 1966 and early 1967, consumers in recent months have shown an increased willingness to buy both durable and nondurable goods. Retail sales have grown by a larger amount in the past six months than in the preceding sixteen months.

In 1968, the cyclical upswing in consumer purchases will continue, but enthusiasm will be somewhat dampened by the extra burden imposed by higher taxes. The surtax, plus the increase in the social security tax because of the rise in the taxable wage base, will more than offset the effect of increased social security benefits. Consumer expenditures next year are likely to rise at a somewhat restrained \$7 billion per quarter. Although this is a lesser rate of gain than at present, it will nevertheless amount to a large overall increase. Total consumer spending in 1968 is likely to rise by about \$28 billion, providing a steady boost to the economy as a whole.

THE ECONOMY IN 1968

Now what does this all add up to for the 1968 business outlook? I have pointed out that government spending next year will increase by \$16 billion. Consumer purchases are likely to be up by \$28 billion. Housing, inventories, and capital expenditures will all rise moderately, providing a total boost of about \$10 billion. Adding together these major buying segments, we come up with the conclusion that total demand for the output of the American economy in 1968 is likely to increase by about \$54 billion. National output for the full year 1968 is thus likely to total \$840 billion, a gain of almost 7 per cent above 1967.

The economy which I have pictured for the year ahead is a prosperous economy. A surtax of 5 per cent effective at the beginning of 1968 will not unduly depress our growth. I should like to repeat, however, that there is little evidence at this time that the demands on the economy next year will outstrip our productive ability. If Congress should mistakenly accede to the Administration proposal for a heavy surtax, the business outlook would be much less favorable than that which I have presented. The result could be a smaller real output of goods and services, a lesser rather than a greater revenue to the Treasury, and a larger rather than a smaller deficit in the Federal budget.

I believe that the economic experience of the past two years suggests that we must attempt in the future to apply fiscal and monetary policy with a lighter, and steadier hand. An extreme monetary policy which produces a credit "crunch" has proved to be undesirable both because of its uneven pressure on various segments of the economy and because of its disruption of overall economic growth. The on-again, off-again application of taxes, as illustrated in the case of the investment tax incentives, has been shown to be bad economics quite apart from the ill-timing of the 1967 experience. We have recently over-controlled the economy in much the same way that the novice driver nervously swings the wheel first in one direction and then in the opposite direction as his vehicle lurches down the road. What is needed is a steadier and more gentle pressure at the helm.

In 1968, the revenue of the Federal Government will grow substantially even without any increase in the tax rate. A modest surtax will provide ample insurance against excessive demand. We are not on the verge of a wild boom, nor a financial catastrophe, as some have testified. If we can resist the temptation to once again push fiscal and monetary policy to the extreme, the economy will move forward in an orderly and prosperous fashion in 1968, setting a firm base for continued economic progress in the years beyond.

THE MILWAUKEE SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the State of Wisconsin has achieved a notable high in the field of education.

Along with its several large distinguished universities—both public and private—and its eminent smaller, liberal arts colleges, stands the Milwaukee School of Engineering.

Industry owes much to the large core of skilled craftsmen and technicians upon which it can draw. Milwaukee School of Engineering has educated over 65,000 of these trained brains, a noteworthy number of whom hold key positions in our industries.

It offers over 300 courses leading to certificates and degrees in 2-year, 4-year, and advanced programs.

The institution owes its success to its president, Karl O. Werwath, who succeeded his father, Oscar Werwath, Milwaukee School of Engineering's founder, in 1948.

I wish Milwaukee School of Engineering continued success in helping to make Wisconsin a good State in which to do business.

I ask unanimous consent that an article describing the Milwaukee School of Engineering, published in the August issue of the Wisconsin Business News magazine, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VITAL COMMODITY

The most important commodity developed in Wisconsin is the human mind . . . the highly and specially trained brainpower that has for years, is now and will continue to be in the future, have a key position in the control of our industrial destiny and the direction of our overall national wellbeing.

Here in Wisconsin are trained and educated the men and women of key responsibility in the running of the machinery of the world.

They come from all parts of the state . . . of the nation . . . they come from many foreign lands. They come seeking the answers to many questions in many divergent areas of specialized interest. They come to learn how to live in the world of today and to learn how to solve the problems of the future. They come in huge and growing numbers each with a separate need, a separate requirement, an individual goal.

Yet as highly individual, as highly specialized as these brilliant minds are, many of them . . . actually more than 65,000 of them . . . have one major thing in common—Source of Knowledge.

Widely diversified, and highly successful, specialists—such as:

T. W. Bruner, President, Bruner Corp., Milwaukee.

T. S. Bilbo, Flight Director, Jet Propulsion Lab.

J. L. Gordon, Ch. of Board, Central Illinois Electric and Gas Co.

Shahpoor Farhadi, Ch. Technical Ministry, Teheran, Iran.

R. E. Fieulleau, Sup. Electronic Engineer, N.Y. Naval Shipyard, U.S. Navy.

E. F. Webb, President, Webb Engineering Associates.

G. O. Henderson, Chief, Navigation & Guidance Project, Grumman Aircraft.

H. A. Hogan, Dir., Test Engineering, AC Electronics, Milwaukee.

W. Van Zeeland, Penetrations Aids Branch, Office of Secretary of Defense, U.S. Govt.

Dr. G. J. Murphy, Ch. Elec. Eng. Dept. Northwestern University.

H. U. Hjermstad, President, Electro-Seal Corp.—have one thing in common:

Each one of these men . . . and 65,000 more . . . received training at Milwaukee School of Engineering.

IT BEGAN IN 1903

At 11th and Winnebago Street. And it began with Oscar Werwath. Although only 22 years old, this rarely gifted young man had already achieved a singular recognition both academically and industrially. Graduating at 18 with degrees in both electrical and mechanical engineering Oscar Werwath had, in four years, risen to a position of supervision in the installation of major electrical projects in principal cities throughout northern Europe. In 1903 he brought to Milwaukee the key ingredients for the establishment of the foundation of advanced technical instruction in this part of the country and through his association with the Mechanical Appliance Company (later to become the Louis Allis Company) was formed MSOE.

Four years and 250 students later the School went through the first of a long and still continuing series of physical expansions. At this time just two full time day school, two semester courses, were offered, but evening courses and 4-semester courses were soon added and the faculty expanded to six instructors.

Success and growth became a way of life with Oscar Werwath and success and growth came because of his dedication to the delivery of a superior product. The development of the superior mind through the application of superior methods. The result—the continuing result—we have in Milwaukee today in the impressive form of one of the principal pillars of the technical academic structure of the most highly technological nation in the world.

LOOK AT THE FACTS

The School is internationally recognized. Over 300 subjects are offered in 2-year programs for engineering technicians, 4-year programs for graduate engineers and advanced degree programs for Master's degrees.

The faculty and staff exceed 200 with present enrollment approximately 3000. The current annual operating budget exceeds 2½ million dollars and assets have grown to \$7 million. The School is chartered by the state of Wisconsin and is governed by a nonprofit, nonstock, corporation of 83 businessmen and industrialists headed by Ch. Fred F. Look, President, Allen Bradley Co. Student services are the finest and most complete including counseling, health, housing, loans, scholarships, financial aids, part-time employment and full-time placement.

Degrees are available in the following engineering and engineering technology courses: Computer, Electrical Power, Architectural Engineering, Electronic Communications, Air Conditioning, Building Construction Technology, Fluid Power, Industrial Engineering, Internal Combustion Engines, Metallurgical, Welding, and Chemical Production. General courses include Economics, Industrial Psychology, Marketing, Management, Accounting, Industrial Relations, Finance, Engineering Graphics, Languages, Speech, Logic, Ethics, Business Law, and Creative Thinking. And many more.

RESEARCH

For over 32 years Milwaukee School of Engineering has been a primary contributor to the advancement of industrial research. Organized in 1935 the MSOE Industrial Research Institute has conducted continuous research projects in engineering and allied fields to provide training for industrial scientists and engineers. This Institute serves as an experimental station for industrial research investigation in applied engineering

and as a clearing house on specific scientific information.

Similarly, but in more specific areas of industrial application, the Institute of Leather Technology and the Fluid Power Institute provide the most modern and the most complete facilities for advanced areas of education and research. The M.S.O.E. Computation Center serves the dual purpose in both educational and industrial research programs and is available to industry and business for sponsored projects. Most recent of this type of addition is the Institute For Non Destructive Testing put into operation in the fall of last year. This new department will, in addition to adding a two year program in Non Destructive Testing Technology and Radiology to the curriculum, open new vistas of non-destructive test research and consultation to industry through sponsored conferences and seminars.

So the Werwath tradition of developing the vital commodity of the educated human mind continues in rising tempo and in phase with the accelerating demands of today's . . . and tomorrow's . . . industrial and economic complex. Under the direction of Karl O. Werwath, president of the institution since the death of his father, founder Oscar Werwath, in 1948, the school has virtually doubled annual enrollments, materially enlarged the faculty, staff and physical facilities and increased assets by seven fold. And while the basic philosophy of developing the superior mind through the use of superior means remains the keystone of the entire educational structure, a new dimension in the process of learning is taking on importance and momentum both by plan and by necessity.

CONTINUING EDUCATION

More truly than ever before, if you don't keep going ahead you start going backwards. This is particularly and vitally true in terms of education and in recognition of the growing demand for the continuous further development of the already educated businessman and industrialist, M.S.O.E. began a program of accelerated continuing education 25 years ago. Today the benefits of this penetrating analyses of future needs are tangible in multiple form as three basic types of program in continuing education are available to the man (and the organization) who recognizes the imperative demand of keeping up with the state of the art in his particular fields of activity. These three basic types of program are:

Supervisory and management for the Individual

Here, on a regular one-evening-a-week basis, individuals from many areas of business and industry meet in groups to learn improved methods of handling typical and general supervisory and management problems. In this type of program a selection of specific technical subject matter particular to the individual's needs are elective. Credits are applicable to degree.

Special company programs

For corporate groups, these programs are custom designed to meet the needs of a particular firm. Courses may include both technical and supervisory subjects and may be presented in seminar form or in prescribed weekly meetings. Such special company programs have already been developed in the areas of physics, chemistry, standard costs for manufacturing, metallurgy, welding, statistical control, materials testing, basic economics and engineering graphics.

Selected subjects and degree programs

Here the businessman-student can choose an individual subject or series of subjects in a particular field, earning a subject or course certificate upon completion. This type of program can be continued to the completion of a Degree of Associate in Industrial Manage-

ment and, in addition, credits earned in the physical sciences may be applied to a Bachelor of Science degree. Programs leading to the degrees of Master of Science in fluid power engineering and in engineering management are also offered.

Here in Wisconsin are trained and educated the men and women of key responsibility in the running of the machinery of the world.

Have you taken the time recently to examine and evaluate your own individual, and corporate, continuing education needs?

During this period Karl Werwath achieved, among many other awards, the distinction of being the only member of the American Society For Engineering Education to receive both the James H. McGraw Award for Outstanding Contribution to Development of Technical Institution Education and the Arthur L. Williston Award for the Publication of Literature on Technical Institution Education.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11722) to authorize certain construction at military installations and for other purposes.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, last week the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd] moved to strike title II from the pending bill, S. 2388, the 1967 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, and later offered a motion which would have the effect of recommitting the bill to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee with instructions to strike title II.

The amendment which I have offered, Mr. President, will, if adopted, change the instructions in the motion to recommit. It removes the requirement that title II be stricken.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the effect of this amendment, if adopted, would be to change the instructions of the motion to recommit. It removes the requirement that title II be stricken. Instead, the amendment instructs the Labor and Public Welfare Committee to report back the bill, S. 2388, forthwith with the following changes in title II.

First. Instead of a 2-year program to

taking \$2.8 billion, the authorization would be limited to \$875 million until expended.

Second. A provision would be added which would have the effect of giving priority for jobs under all parts of title II to eligible persons who are heads of families. By heads of families, we mean a person who contributes more than one-half the support of one or more other persons.

Third. A provision would be added which would earmark not less than 10 percent nor more than 20 percent of the \$875 million authorization to be used by the Secretary of Labor for the purpose of expanding the Manpower Development Training Act of 1962.

Finally, a provision for reserving from \$100 to \$300 million for use by the Secretary of Labor as incentive for private industry to engage in job training programs would be included. The Secretary would be authorized to make grants to private industry for employee training expenses of an employer.

Mr. President, I shall discuss each of these provisions in some detail and then explain, why with these changes, title II of the Emergency Employment Act of 1967 is acceptable to me.

Under the provisions of my amendment, the authorization for the Emergency Employment Act of title II would only be for 1 year. The total authorization for 1 year has been cut by \$500 million. I have not suggested a greater reduction because the need for jobs and job training is pressing and grave. The expense, although great, is justifiable because by training and retraining men, we are investing in their future productivity and contributing to the wealth of the Nation. By creating jobs for those who cannot be trained, we are enabling people to have self-respect and to at least earn a living rather than merely receive welfare.

However, Mr. President, this is a large program involving a great deal of money. Rather than to authorize it for 2 years, I think it might be worthwhile to reevaluate effects of the various parts in 1 year's time and perhaps make some changes in programs before expending additional funds.

One of the objections I have had to the programs already created under the Economic Opportunity Act is that they have not been properly examined, and once established, we have been reluctant to cut them back much less to eradicate them. Let us not make the same mistake with the Goliath of an employment act. By authorizing expenditures for 1 year, we commit ourselves to an examination and reevaluation next year. We retain flexibility.

Mr. President, it has been estimated that some 3 million able-bodied Americans are for the most part unemployed. In addition, there are some 5 million Americans who work for less than the minimum wage.

The cost of providing merely the 3 million with jobs at the minimum wage has been estimated at \$12 billion annually. Obviously at this juncture we are not able to expend such a vast sum of money. But who is to decide which of these people is to receive either job train-

ing or public service jobs to the exclusion of the others?

I suggest, Mr. President, in view of the limited authorization that priority be given to one particular group of Americans; namely, the head of the family.

Garth L. Mangum, in a paper entitled "Government as Employer of Last Resort," presents some excellent reasons for giving priority to heads of families. He states that there need to be more programs offering job opportunities for youths under 20, but notes that out-of-school, out-of-work youths are not often always attracted by minimum wage make-work jobs or motivated to retrain in them. Basic education and training are far more important for them. He goes on to say:

A little over one half of the long-term unemployed men and one-fourth of the long-term unemployed women in 1966 were married family heads. So were 60 per cent of the out of the labor force males and half of the involuntary part-time workers. Limiting the employment guarantee to family heads would therefore be a defensible initial approach.

Family heads, Mangum presumes, would be more motivated to remain in jobs, especially if training were provided.

By giving priority to family heads, we provide the out-of-work fathers or mothers with children an opportunity to regain both self-sufficiency and self-esteem. In this way, a better family environment can be encouraged which will have a beneficial effect on the children who will be tomorrow's providers. The concept of the family is basic to our society and whatever we can do to uphold the integrity of that institution will contribute to the well being of all of our citizens and our Nation. There is increasing evidence that a broken home is detrimental to children. It inhibits the learning process and perhaps contributes to juvenile delinquency.

Thus, by giving priority to heads of families, the older generation is directly benefited and the younger generation receives indirect benefits.

Mr. President, the second section of my proposed amendment which I would like to discuss in part C, authorization for Manpower Development and Training Act. In essence, this section requires that not less than 10 percent or more than 20 percent of the funds authorized for title II must be used through the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

I have earmarked this proportion of the funds for Manpower Development and Training Act, Mr. President, for several reasons. First, I believe that it is the most effective training program in existence today. Second, it can easily, and, in fact, needs to be expanded. Finally, it can be incorporated into the type of comprehensive manpower and training approach which I have been advocating.

The Manpower Development and Training Act has been widely acclaimed because of its flexibility and because of its achievements. Secretary Willard Wirtz, speaking at hearings before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee's Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower in 1965, cited the "basic

soundness of training programs under Manpower Development and Training Act" and recommended that the act be put on a more permanent basis. He said:

The effectiveness of an active manpower policy as carried out under the MDTA is now clear from the record of proven experience. There is no doubt that the training and retraining of unemployed workers is a sound social and financial investment.

In 1966, Congress enacted substantial amendments, demonstrating that Manpower Development and Training Act was a "living, changing law" with "flexibility and capacity to adapt quickly to changing needs." The amendments substantially changed Manpower Development and Training Act to make it more effective an instrument for combating unemployment among the poor.

The Manpower Development and Training Act was redirected in 1966 toward the poor, by specifying that 65 percent of the training effort would be "person-oriented" or directed toward the reclamation of hardcore unemployed. The groups which were to receive the greatest attention were enumerated. They included: "culturally impoverished and poorly educated youth, the unemployed of middle age or older, minority groups, persons with low educational attainment, the long-term unemployed, and the rural poor."

Further, in 1966, the on-the-job training component of Manpower Development and Training Act was expanded. In fiscal year 1967, the on-the-job training program will constitute 50 percent of all Manpower Development and Training Act training. This is a vast increase from 1963, when the on-the-job training portion of Manpower Development and Training Act was only 6 percent. In addition, participation by private industry has increased. In 1963 only 400 businesses were involved, while today over 2,000 are involved.

VALUE OF MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

The amended act has been highly praised. Sar Levitan in a paper entitled, "Alternative Approaches to Manpower Policies," states:

During its five years of operation, MDTA has demonstrated its effectiveness. Available studies, though limited, indicate that benefits exceed costs; and the program has proven adaptable to changing policy goals and labor market conditions.

Stephen Kurzman, in a paper entitled "Private Enterprise Participation in the Antipoverty Program" concludes that:

On-The-Job Training stimulated by the cost reimbursement treatment method under the MDT Act appears to be a highly effective tool for training and placing the unemployed and under-employed in satisfying jobs.

Available statistics substantiate the fact that both institutional and on-the-job training components are relatively successful in placing graduates in jobs. Institutional trainees averaged 73.6 percent initial placement over the first 3 years and on-the-job training averaged 93.1 percent initial placement. Both of these figures contrast favorably with 50 percent of all those public assistance recipients who entered work training and

experience programs only to return to welfare roles upon completion of the program.

Prof. Garth Mangum, in an interview recently, stated that a much higher percentage of Manpower Development and Training Act enrollees than he had thought were actually extremely disadvantaged. He declared he had evidence that one-half of the family heads in Manpower Development and Training Act had incomes of less than \$3,000 a year when they entered the program.

Manpower Development and Training Act has been very successful in both meeting particular skill shortages and in establishing skill ladders. It has alleviated skill shortages in jobs which require less than 2 years of training and has made significant contributions in the fields of machine operators, welders, motor vehicle mechanics, and body repairmen, secretaries, and draftsmen.

The on-the-job training part of Manpower Development and Training Act has been particularly successful in meeting skill shortages. The President's manpower report to Congress describes one such example:

The OJT program in the tool and die industry is an outstanding example of this industry-Government approach to a skill shortage situation. Since early 1964, a project sponsored by the Department of Labor and conducted by the National Tool, Die, and Precision Machining Association has provided opportunities for preapprenticeship or apprenticeship entry training for unemployed persons as tool and die makers and machinists. The project was so successful that in March 1966 the Department extended it to provide training for 1800 workers, bringing the total number of trainees under the project to nearly 3000.

The same report gives two examples of programs which are particularly successful in upgrading the skills of workers, many of whom are disadvantaged:

For example, under a national agreement with the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, 1,000 journeymen are to be given training which will upgrade their skills, and 2,000 unemployed men are to be trained as carpenter apprentices. About half the trainees will receive preapprenticeship training in a coupled project and the other half will enter apprenticeship directly. The employers will receive on-the-job training assistance for 26 weeks of the four-year apprenticeship term.

The same pattern is seen in a major pilot project, launched early in 1967 in New York City, to upgrade the skills of 2,500 employed workers. The four major unions and industrial leaders involved are committed to filling the vacated less skilled jobs with entry workers drawn from minority groups and the ranks of disadvantaged and long-term unemployed.

Because of the facts which I have cited, Mr. President, I think it is fair to conclude that the Manpower Development and Training Act has been an effective and highly successful program. Obviously, it would be advantageous to expand such a program. However, we must first consider whether or not the Manpower Development and Training Act program can easily be expanded to the degree to which I recommend.

I believe that it can be expanded. Stephen Kurzman, in his report which I quoted earlier, stated:

The present level of the on-the-job training program is . . . both highly fortuitous and considerably lower than its apparent potential.

A noted authority in the job training field who has been intensively studying the Manpower Development and Training Act around the country, continually asked the question: "Given your present capacity, how much could you expand the Manpower Development and Training Act immediately?" He reported that he never was given any figure less than double, saying:

They have people who are available in general to go into the program and they have the capability in general to expand it very rapidly. But nobody has made that kind of proposal for MDTA.

I am making that kind of proposal, Mr. President.

I have indicated that the Manpower Development and Training Act has been successful, and I have quoted several authorities who believe that the Manpower Development and Training Act can and should be expanded. These facts alone justify my inclusion of 10 percent to 20 percent delegation of title II funds to Manpower Development and Training Act. However, there is still another reason why it is important to expand this program.

Last week, when I addressed the Senate, I spoke of the desperate need for a coordinated, comprehensive approach to the problems of poverty. I indicated that this kind of approach was particularly imperative with regard to unemployment and underemployment problems in order to alleviate the recent piecemeal efforts.

In order to be truly comprehensive, a job training program must treat the multiple ills of the disadvantaged unemployed or underemployed person. The Manpower Development and Training Act, with the enactment of the 1966 amendments began to supply supportive services—namely, medical services to enrollees. Increased attention has been given to the necessity for reclaiming individuals as well as merely training them. The President's manpower report to Congress notes that—

With the funds available, the target set for fiscal year 1965 was training for 250,000 individuals—a reduction from the 275,000 total for the previous year, since it was recognized that the new emphasis on the disadvantaged would require more intensive effort with many individual trainees. Training emphasis was to be equally divided between institutional and on-the-job training, and special attention was to be given to enlisting greater assistance from industry in training for upgrading and in providing opportunity for the disadvantaged.

It was recognized that no sharp dividing line could in fact be drawn between the two aspects of the training program—human reclamation and the remedy of skill shortages.

I have noted time and time again, Mr. President, that there is much duplicity and overlap in job training programs. I believe, however, that if the best programs can be expanded, some of the ineffectual ones can be phased out. Then perhaps we can coordinate the remaining ones. Sar Levitan, in "Poverty and Human Resources Abstract" of September—

October 1966 decries this lack of integration:

The fragmentation of federally supported training programs assumes crucial significance when the impact upon clientele is considered....

The defects of the present system have become particularly pronounced as labor shortages develop in an increasing number of communities and occupations. In a looser labor market, when jobs are scarcer, a training program may become a holding operation. But in the present labor market, as the demand for labor intensifies, the training programs should become an integral part of labor supply, as activities of the training programs are increasingly a concern of broader sections of the population.

An increased emphasis on Manpower Development and Training Act and its endorsement and inclusion in the Economic Opportunity Act could perhaps be a step in the integration process.

Finally, Mr. President, I have stated time and time again that the poverty war cannot be won by the efforts of the Government alone. The involvement and participation of all segments of the community must be sought. On-the-job training in particular encourages the participation of private industry. An expanded Manpower Development and Training Act program along with the enactment of the human investment provisions of my amendment could achieve this to a large degree. The combination of these two approaches has been recommended by many, including the President's manpower report, which stated:

Various methods or combinations of methods of Government financial assistance for privately administered training programs have been proposed. MDTA on-the-job training, for example, provides one form of current assistance which has been highly successful, although on a limited scale. Large-scale expansion of this program might constitute one approach to the problem. Other suggested approaches would involve incentives such as special taxes coupled with tax credits for business expenditures in connection with on-the-job training programs.

Mr. President, only 290,000 of the 3 million Americans who are unemployed are currently being reached by Federal manpower and training programs. Obviously, this is insufficient performance if we really want to win the war against poverty.

I submit, Mr. President, that the primary reason for this insufficient performance is that we have failed to significantly involve the private sector of our economy. Secretary of Labor Wirtz, in a statement submitted to our committee, acknowledged this deficiency when he said:

The most underdeveloped aspect of the manpower program (and possibly the poverty program as well) involves the potential for increased private participation.

In April of this year the manpower report of the President also recognized this difficulty when it stated:

If the enormous occupational training task which will face the Nation during the next several years is to be successfully accomplished, greater Government-industry effort in the area of skills training will be required. Basic issues should be jointly examined—such as the better coordination and division of training responsibility between private industry, Government, and the educational system; the need for broad planning and co-

ordination of the Nation's total training effort; and the possibility and desirability of financial assistance to employers to help them continue to carry the largest share of the training burden.

But, Mr. President, a mere recognition of the fact that greater Government-industry effort is needed is not enough. Our poor performance in the area of skills training points up the need for substantially greater participation by industry. We in Congress must enact legislation which will stimulate private industry to increase job training for unemployed or low income Americans.

It was with this need in mind that I, together with 120 other Republicans, sponsored the Human Investment Act. Unfortunately, legislative action on the Human Investment Act has been delayed primarily because of its provision for a general tax credit incentive. Apparently the tax credit is alien to the philosophy which presupposes the need for direct Federal control over all Government-subsidized manpower training programs.

Since I believe the need for a substantially increased effort in manpower training is now acute, I have made an effort in this amendment to set aside philosophical disagreements over the tax credit approach. Consequently, I have modified the human investment approach to remove the tax credit feature.

Even with this modification, I believe the human investment approach represents a major step forward. It offers possibilities for widespread involvement by private industry.

Primarily, Mr. President, the human investment approach is based on the premise that job training under the direct auspices of private industry is generally preferable to institutional training conducted by Government. There are a number of reasons why I believe this premise is sound.

First, job training by private industry minimizes the necessity for Government intervention and regulation in the economy. The Government does not need to get into the business of screening instructors, determining curriculum, supporting trainees, and other such appendages of Government-run programs, beyond the point of assuring that useful training is, in fact, being imparted by the employer.

Federal-State complications, elaborate placement procedures, and general administrative problems are largely avoided. It is interesting in this connection to note that the British Government, faced with the identical problem in 1963, chose to promote job training through private industry instead of setting up an elaborate Government-operated program.

Second, the great majority of those trained by private business are actually employees on the payroll. A number of studies, notably that by Prof. Richard Cloward of Columbia University's School of Social Work, reported in the January 1965 issue of *American Child*, have shown that the motivation of an unskilled and unemployed person to complete a training program bears a different relation to his perceived chance for obtaining employment promptly at the conclusion of his training.

Much of the dropout problem in such

institutional programs as the Job Corps and the Manpower Development and Training Act are traceable to a sense of discouragement and uncertainty felt by the trainee with respect to his job chances after training. When the trainee has been positively assured that he will be hired for a given job if he satisfactorily completes the training, the chances that he will abandon the program decrease drastically.

One of the most pitiful spectacles to me, Mr. President, is the spectacle of a man who has completed a Manpower Development and Training Act institutional program, only to find that there are no job openings for him in his area. When private firms are responsible for the training, however, the trainee is almost invariably either hired at the beginning or given a firm promise of employment when his training is complete. This point has been driven home ably by Mr. M. S. Hutcheson, general president of the Carpenter's Union, in his editorial in the February 1966 issue of the *Carpenter*. Mr. Hutchinson writes:

A realistic approach to training programs ought to be a fundamental part of the government's attitude toward eliminating poverty. Any program undertaken ought to be based on a reasonable assumption that there will be a place for a youngster when he has completed his training. Any other approach is neither fair to the youngster, to the industry, or to the nation.

I believe it is indisputably true that private industry people, far more than the Government or institutional personnel, know where and what the jobs will be.

Third, when private industry trains a man it invests in him. That investment is made with the expectation that the trainee can contribute to the company's productivity as an employee following training—else it would be difficult to justify the expense to the stockholder. Thus there is a built-in bias in favor of the employer giving top quality training, carefully designed to prepare the trainee for a position for which a worker is needed.

It would make little sense for a firm to train men and women as a public service project, and then see its investment wasted because the company has no appropriate job openings. Speaking on this point, Prof. William Faunce of the Labor and Industrial Relations Center of Michigan State University has said:

A retraining program which did not involve retraining with respect to specific job openings is not a meaningful retraining program.

Here training by private industry has a great advantage over solely Government-run programs.

Fourth, the instructors in on-the-job training programs are directly involved in the latest day-to-day developments in the field. Unlike instructors in schools, they are in the forefront of innovation and technological change, and thus can give, by and large, more up-to-date instruction to trainees.

Fifth, private industry can train workers on the latest models of machines without necessarily investing in new equipment for the purpose. Faced by

the rapid pace of innovation in many training fields, schools too often are left with the choice between trying to train people on obsolete equipment or obtaining new equipment, with a resulting increase in the cost of the training program. This fact accounts for a large part of the cost savings that can be realized by utilizing the resources of private industry for job training.

Sixth, by training the trainee in the context of an actual job situation, private industry provides a more realistic preparation for continued employment. The trainee is spared the problem of making what may be a difficult adjustment from a simulated to an actual work-site. To many trainees at the bottom end of the ladder, the prospect of regular employment with a company is a strange and bewildering experience. To have to adjust to this situation at the moment of maximum subconscious anxiety—just when training in an institutional program has been completed—puts an additional psychological burden on the worker, which may be reflected in poor performance.

This factor does not apply, of course, in the case of longtime workers who are merely changing from one line of employment to another via retraining. In the case of a hard-core unemployed person, however, it merits consideration.

Seventh, on-the-job training has conclusively proven to be more economical than the equivalent institutional training. Experience of the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training in comparing per hour costs of trainees in institutional and in on-the-job training programs shows that where the average cost of the former runs over \$5 per hour, the latter cost the taxpayer only 55 cents per hour. Even when the wage of the trainee, paid by the employer, is added on, it is still obvious that the on-the-job programs are more than twice as economical as the school programs.

Indeed, Labor Secretary Wirtz, in reply to my question submitted at a Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee hearing last February, stated:

There is considerable economy in on the job training over institutional training. The average cost per trainee in on the job training is approximately one third that of the average total cost of institutional training.

At the same time he presented new figures from calendar year 1965 experience, showing the average cost to the taxpayer of on-the-job training programs to be \$26 per week per trainee, while the cost of institutional training ran about \$60 per week per trainee. Even though the two types of training are not directly comparable without some qualification, it is still clear that from a taxpayer's point of view, training on the job means money saved.

Eighth, on-the-job training is adaptable to any size training class and to any location, urban or rural. Institutional classes are limited to minimum numbers which may not exceed the required number of workers in a given occupation. Institutional facilities are not often available at all in rural areas; private business, however, can design programs for even one trainee—small firms with one apprentice in training are not un-

common. In fact, as of spring 1962, more than half of the apprentices surveyed in a national survey conducted by the Labor Department were employed in establishments with fewer than 100 workers.

Industry, as well as unemployed and low income persons, would greatly benefit from the human investment approach. My amendment would provide an incentive to private industry for improving its manpower efficiency and to fulfill its social obligations.

Many businessmen are faced with employee inefficiencies because they cannot afford the total cost of adequate job training or retraining. This amendment would provide enough incentive for many businessmen to intensify training programs thus increasing business efficiency.

Equally important, severe manpower shortages plaguing many parts of the country could be eased. New York State, for one, has suffered severely from skill shortages. According to the New York Times of January 8, 1967, State Senate Majority Leader Earl W. Bridges reported alarming shortages of skilled personnel in a number of areas, including skilled and semiskilled trades. In doing so he announced the formation of a special ad hoc committee of the State Senate to survey the manpower problem and recommend means for its solution.

LABOR SHORTAGE NOW

Sylvia Porter, the well-known financial columnist, reports in her column of January 12, 1967, in Burlington, Vt., Free Press:

So severe are some skill shortages, in fact, that corporations, schools and government agencies are now raiding each other to fill job openings, paying bonuses of up to \$300 to employees who can deliver new job recruits, scouring Canada and Europe for employees.

Miss Porter concludes:

The basic, long term answer to skill shortages can only be drastically improved and increased vocational education and job training by private industry as well as by government agencies.

Industry could not only prosper economically from this amendment, but also better fulfill its social obligations. In recent months we have all sensed a willingness by many businessmen to become involved in the war on poverty. In Rochester, N.Y., for example, I understand businessmen have agreed to provide jobs for over 2,000 unemployed. These businesses have carried out obligations to society without subsidies or monetary incentives. However, realistically we cannot expect all businesses to follow the lead of the Rochester businessmen without some incentive. I believe this amendment would encourage substantially increased participation in the war on poverty by businessmen throughout the country.

The human investment approach, Mr. President, would benefit unemployed or low-income individuals. It would also benefit industry. And finally, Mr. President, it would benefit the Federal Government by relieving some of the burdens of the war on poverty.

Mr. President, I have just described the four significant changes in the Emergency Employment Act of 1967 that my amendment would make. I be-

lieve that I have demonstrated the desirability of limiting the authorization to 1 year, gearing the program to heads of families, utilizing the excellent experience we have had under the Manpower Development and Training Act, and initiating a human investment approach as an incentive for greater participation by private industry.

Now, Mr. President, I imagine that many are wondering what has prompted me to change my mind concerning the enactment of the Emergency Employment Act of 1967. On this floor last week I noted that the title II program was reminiscent of New Deal days and only a make-work program which did not represent a long-range solution to unemployment problems.

Even though I had doubts concerning the advisability of enacting title II as originally proposed, I was aware that large segments of the American population desperately need assistance. I realize, Mr. President, that the number unemployed and looking for work in the United States has averaged nearly 3 million during the first half of 1967. I realize, Mr. President, that to reduce unemployment to a rate of 3 percent would take 600,000 new jobs. I realize, Mr. President, that meeting unemployment with jobs is central to solving the crisis of our cities and rural areas.

While these statistics, Mr. President, demand constructive action during this session of Congress, I could not see instituting a \$2.8 billion work relief program for a 2-year period.

After taking a hard look at the provisions of title II, I am convinced that if my amendments to it are adopted it could have a beneficial impact on our Nation.

First of all, Mr. President, it would get down to the serious work of training thousands of unemployed persons to become productive members of our society. In years to come, taxes from these individuals alone would more than pay for the Emergency Employment Act of 1967.

Second, Mr. President, it would provide industry with a real incentive to become a fullfledged partner with Government in this war on poverty. As I have pointed out so many times on this floor, the Federal Government alone cannot do the job of eliminating poverty. There must be a coordinated and comprehensive effort by the Federal, State and local governments, and above all both the private sector of the economy and organized labor must become fully involved.

Third, Mr. President, I fully realize that there are some unemployed persons who would not respond to job training in any way, shape or form. What do we do with this type of individual, Mr. President? Do we give him relief checks and let him sit on his front porch playing cribbage and drinking beer? Do we forget about him and let him become a beggar? Do we ignore him and hope that some way he will disappear?

Realistically, Mr. President, I think that we have to realize that for some individuals the Government must become the employer of last resort. I know, Mr. President, that considering the Govern-

ment as the employer of last resort conjures up the image of the "shovel leaning" WPA worker of the 30's. I am sure that part of the Emergency Employment Act of 1967 would generate a few "shovel leaners." But, also, Mr. President, it will restore the dignity which can only come from productive work for thousands of individuals who have become accustomed to hopelessness, despair, and laziness in that order.

EMPLOYER OF LAST RESORT

Prof. Garth Mangum points out in a recent paper that:

Ways may be found to attract employers to depressed areas and neighborhoods, or to get the unemployed and underemployed out of them. Until then—and the day appears far off—reasonably adequate solutions to the social and personal problems of the employable but competitively disadvantaged will require the government to act as "employer of last resort."

Finally, Mr. President, I have pointed out numerous times that the administration has been plagued by a definite performance gap between promises and results. Part of the reason for this performance gap has been an apparent inability to attack any one area of poverty with the determination and drive necessary to eliminate that particular problem. In the area of job training the performance gap is all too apparent for thousands of unemployed and low income individuals who continue to become more economically disadvantaged each day. For too many of them federally sponsored job training programs have been but an illusion. Their lives have remained unaffected in any way, shape or form.

I believe, Mr. President, the enactment of the Emergency Employment Act as changed by my amendment would diminish the performance gap now plaguing the Federal Government. More important, Mr. President, it would enable thousands of individuals who have become victims of abject poverty and the welfare dole to lead a meaningful life.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I point out briefly the effects of this proposed amendment.

First, it would cut title II authorization from \$2.8 billion to \$875 million, plus \$50 million for interest-free repayable loans for purchase of training equipment and supplies.

Second, it would permit the Secretary of Labor to use up to \$328,125,000 of the \$875 million for human investment training programs by private industry, pursuant to plans approved by the Secretary.

Third, it would permit the Secretary of Labor to use up to \$175 million of the \$875 million for on-the-job training and other programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

Fourth, it would require the Secretary of Labor to give priority in filling all employment and training openings created by title II programs to unemployed and low-income persons who are the heads of families.

Fifth, it would expand the definition of "eligible areas" to include rural areas with problems of outmigration.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this represents a reasonable compromise be-

tween the positions of those who favor the adoption of title II of the bill in its present form and those who would eliminate it entirely. Also, Mr. President, my amendment concentrates more on training programs, making it possible for the unemployed and the underemployed to acquire skills necessary and essential to enable them to become productive, self-supporting citizens.

I very much hope, Mr. President, that the Senate will look with favor upon my proposal.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I am very much interested in the Senator's proposal. As he knows, he and I have discussed it, and I have discussed it with some of my Democratic colleagues on the subcommittee which held the initial hearings on this bill.

I should like to see whether the Senator and I are in accord—and I will not detain him long—as to the basic principles of his amendment.

I understand, first, that the amendment would cut the authorization from a 2-year authorization to a 1-year authorization. Is that correct?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. In the original Emergency Employment Act which I introduced, and which the committee brought to the floor, the authorization for the first year would have been \$1.3 billion, of which \$300 million would have been set aside for tooling up, hardware, and making available the facilities through which the program would operate.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. CLARK. What the Senator has done has been to reduce that \$1.3 billion to \$925 million, of which \$50 million would be set aside for tooling up and hardware?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes; and I think it should be pointed out that the \$50 million is in the form of loans which will be repayable.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct; and they are non-interest-bearing loans?

Mr. PROUTY. That is right.

Mr. CLARK. My third point would be that the Senator's amendment puts greater stress on the job training than does the original Emergency Employment Act.

Mr. PROUTY. Yes. As the Senator knows, I feel very strongly about that. It is one of the most important things we must do if we are to enable people who are now unemployable to learn skills and becoming self-supporting.

Mr. CLARK. I share the Senator's view that on-the-job training needs as much emphasis as we can reasonably give it, and the on-the-job training emphasis is directed at the hard-core poor who are unemployable, is it not?

Mr. PROUTY. That is true.

Mr. CLARK. As I understand, the Senator intends, under part (b) of his amendment, which I think is referred to as the human investment part of the amendment, to give encouragement to private industry to employ hard-core poor after adequate on-the-job training.

In order to do that, there is an inducement to private industry in the form of the payment of a subsidy—perhaps the Senator would prefer some other word; that is the first word that occurred to me—represented by the difference between what it costs to train a hard-core poor individual and what it would cost to train an ordinary employee.

Mr. PROUTY. That is the purpose of the amendment, and of my approach in the human investment program.

Mr. CLARK. With respect to part (b), the Senator's amendment leaves a good deal of flexibility to the Secretary of Labor, does it not, in that the Secretary would have discretion, within a limitation of a low of 12½ percent of the \$875 million and a high of 37½ percent of the \$875 million, as to how much should be utilized for the human investment program and how much should stay within the original conception of the Emergency Employment Act?

Mr. PROUTY. That is within the discretion of the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. CLARK. So without being very adept at doing mathematics in my head—perhaps the Senator or his staff has done it—what does the 12½ percent figure come to, and what does the 37½ percent figure come to?

Mr. PROUTY. The 12½ percent figure is \$109,375,000; the 37½ percent figure is \$328,125,000.

Mr. CLARK. So, roughly speaking and rounding out the figures, if the Secretary has to take the lower amount, there would be a high in excess of \$700 million left for the emergency employment part of the bill.

Mr. PROUTY. Offhand I think the Senator is approximately correct.

Mr. CLARK. If the Secretary were to take the higher figure of 37½ percent, there would still be in excess of \$500 million, would there not, for the emergency part of the bill?

Mr. PROUTY. I think that is true.

Mr. CLARK. I overheard the colloquy between the Senator and his able staff member about the MDTA. Perhaps the Senator will explain to what extent, if at all, that enters into this discussion.

Mr. PROUTY. Certainly in addition to the human investment part of the amendment there is a 10 percent minimum earmarked under MDTA which would amount to \$87.5 million. The maximum which could be spent would be \$175 million.

Mr. CLARK. That would be in addition, would it, to the \$109 million and the \$300-odd million we spoke about before?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct. I point out to the Senator, however, that while this is a 1-year authorization, the amendment contains a provision to make funds available until they have been expended.

Mr. CLARK. I understand. Would the Senator, as an experienced legislator, agree with me, it now being the first week in October—and since we are expecting problems in the House and a conference which could be long winded, and a possible veto, although we hope not—that it is not very likely that this legislation will become law much before the end of the year.

Mr. PROUTY. I think that is a fair assumption.

Mr. CLARK. So one-half of the fiscal year 1968 would have passed before this money could even begin to be made available.

Mr. PROUTY. That is very true, and quite frankly, that is one reason why I felt we could reduce the funds rather substantially without curtailing the effect of the poverty program which the Senator and I favor.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator has a good point there. I am more favorably disposed toward his amendment, although I might say quite candidly that I am not in a position to accept it tonight.

I am not at all sure that I can accept it at all. However, I do want to think about it very hard, because it would be very difficult for the Secretary to spend in this fiscal year all the money provided in the original Emergency Employment Act.

Mr. PROUTY. I think that is true. I appreciate the fact that the Senator is going to give appropriate thought to the proposal which I am sure he appreciates is offered in good faith.

I am very much concerned about what I consider to be our No. 1 domestic problem which is the prevalence of poverty. While the Senator and I do not agree on everything, I think philosophically we feel that this is a problem which we must approach along the lines which he and I both seem to feel is desirable and essential.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator and I are in accord that something must be done to give employment potential to the hard core poor who are of employable age. And I agree with the Senator that something more needs to be done with respect to training them in employable skills.

The Senator and I are both realists, and we know that there are limits to what we can expect the Senate to do in this regard, and perhaps even greater limits to what we can expect the House to do.

I commend the Senator for the efforts he has made in working out what may well become an acceptable compromise for the Senate.

So that we can have an appropriate record, I wonder if the Senate would permit me to ask him a couple of additional questions so that I can be sure I understand the full purport of the amendment.

Section 214 of the Senator's amendment would prohibit financial assistance by the Secretary except upon approval of a plan submitted by an employer who desires to receive financial assistance under part (b), the human investment job training part of the Emergency Employment Act.

I take it that refers to a written plan. That plan is required to include under section 214(g):

Information respecting the cost of usual training and other usual services provided employees other than those described in Section 206 of this title, in order to make them fully productive.

They are there described as hard-core corps.

Reading this section in conjunction with section 213 which authorizes finan-

cial assistance for training and employment costs including "unusual training and other unusual services for a limited period when an employee might not be fully productive" would require the Secretary of Labor to determine the unusual training and employment costs by first requiring the establishment of the usual training and employment costs under the plan.

In other words, to make a figure available, we have to know what it would ordinarily cost them and then how much it would cost for this hard-core corps.

Mr. PROUTY. That is absolutely true. We think this is set forth under section 214(g) of the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. In this connection I would think it appropriate for the Secretary to take into account in determining such usual training and other employment costs the following information in addition to other information which the Secretary might require:

First, it would seem to me that the employer should provide the Secretary with a description of the training and services usually provided its new employees. That description should include the usual duration of such training and an analysis of the employer's training costs during a substantial period prior to the submission of the plan.

Second, it would seem to me relevant for the Secretary to consider the normal turnover rates of the employer's employees information on work injuries and absenteeism of employees performing work similar to that which is expected to be performed by low-income or unemployed persons who are to be employed under the plan.

Third, I think some information should also be provided on the productivity and efficiency of the employer's employees.

Lastly, the Secretary may wish to require that the employer provide other information in order to enable the Secretary to determine the amount and rate of financial assistance to be provided an employer for the hiring of poor people under the Senator's amendment.

I am wondering whether the Senator would agree with these observations?

I think it important that the Secretary of Labor have enough flexibility in determining the employer's usual training and other services costs and in determining the information necessary to be included under the plan so that the Secretary would be able to exercise an informed judgment as to the amount of financial assistance to be provided.

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct. And I think this is still at the discretion of the Secretary. I think the language is sufficiently clear so that there is no doubt about certain restrictions which may be placed upon him.

Mr. CLARK. I have another point which disturbs me a little, but I suspect that the Senator is in accord with me on this.

Further, in connection with subsection 214(g), I am concerned that there are no specific legislative safeguards prohibiting the use of the financial assistance provided under the Senator's amendment to assure that this assistance is not used by an employer who typically and

normally has a high turnover rate for his employees. I would hope that the Senator from Vermont would agree that the human investment job training program should not be used by employers which have typically high turnover rates. I do not think it would be advisable, for example, to have a small shop of one sort or another which normally hires persons on a short-term basis receive aid under this act. I am sure the Senator would agree that the purpose of his human investment job training amendment is to create permanent jobs and not merely temporary jobs in industries where turnover rates are particularly high.

Mr. PROUTY. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. CLARK. The third point is that section 213(a) authorizes financial assistance to employers for "training and employment costs incurred pursuant to the plan described in section 214. I think the act is quite clear what the term "training and employment costs" refers to for sections 213(a), (1) through (4) indicate the kinds of reimbursements which would be made by the Secretary to an employer. I would like to ask the Senator from Vermont if he would not agree with me that the language on its face is quite clear that employment costs refers to matters contained within section 213(a) and does not refer to wages, and that his amendment would not authorize a wage subsidy.

Mr. PROUTY. I believe that is the Senator's understanding and I believe he is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to have the Senator make that point.

My semifinal point I wish to raise, as a matter of legislative history, is that subsection 213(a)(2) authorizes the payment of all or part of employer costs of sending recruiters into areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income persons. Would the Senator from Vermont agree that this provision is not intended to duplicate or replace existing recruitment efforts by the U.S. Employment Service and the State public employment offices or other public or private agencies which are currently engaged in the recruitment of unemployed or low-income persons?

Mr. PROUTY. No, it would not duplicate their efforts. It would be an additional means of finding some of the people, if necessary, who need this help. It would not in any sense supplant the activities of the U.S. Employment Service or of State employment services.

Mr. CLARK. Of course, there is an analogy between the human investment job training amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont and the present practices of the Department of Labor in connection with the on-the-job training programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act. Would not the Senator agree that, where appropriate, the rules and regulations established for training under MDTA by the Department of Labor be made applicable to the human investment job training provisions proposed by the Senator from Vermont where such rules and regulations could be adapted to fit the provisions of the Senator's amendment, so

we will not be establishing another jungle of bureaucratic rules with situations which in many ways are substantially identical?

Mr. PROUTY. I believe that is a logical approach, but I should say to the Senator that the final decision must be up to the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator very much for his candid answers to my questions and I assure him that overnight I will give prayerful consideration to accepting his amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. I hope very much that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania will find it possible to accept the amendment, after he has had an opportunity to think about it.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Vermont for his support of this proposal and for his having worked out what I believe is a very useful alternative, which I hope will be favorably acted upon by the Senate.

I support the proposal. I have joined in it with the Senator from Vermont. I hope for its success, and I hope that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania may find that he also will be able to support the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania. I must say that his cooperation and help in drafting this amendment have been extremely valuable. I share his hope that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania will find it possible to accept our proposal.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. In title II of the bill before us, the language would authorize \$1 billion for fiscal year 1968 and \$1.5 billion for fiscal year 1969.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. There would also be an authorization for loans in the amount of \$300 million.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. As I understand the distinguished Senator's amendment to my motion, one of the changes that would be embodied in the instructions which he proposes would be a limitation on the authorization to \$875 million until expended.

Mr. PROUTY. Plus \$50 million for repayable loans, which are noninterest loans but are repayable.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. This brings me to the question I was about to ask the Senator. I have not had an opportunity to read his statement, but I was going to ask whether or not he intended to provide any monies for loans.

Mr. PROUTY. There is \$50 million in the amendment for loans.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. So there will be \$50 million instead of the \$300 million as provided in the bill?

Mr. PROUTY. There is \$50 million in addition to the \$875 million authorization.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. So the \$875 million would be in grants, and

there would be a total of \$50 million in loans?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, although I am a cosponsor with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] of the original bill which is sought now to be amended, it is my judgment that the scheme adopted by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] sharpens and makes even more specific the private enterprise job which I had in mind in effecting several amendments to the bill in its original form which I worked out with the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I think that the Senator from Vermont has rendered us all a valuable service by sharpening and committing specific sums of money for that purpose. In many respects, this amendment proposes incentives to private industry like those I sponsored under section 123(a)(8) of title I of the act, and extends those incentives to something beyond a pilot program in size.

He has limited the program to 1 year. I think that program is more important than that limitation. Therefore, it shall be my intention to support the Senator from Vermont, and I hope very much the majority of the Senate will do the same. I have examined the needs closely and I am more than ever convinced that jobs must be our first priority in attacking the problem of poverty. This bill would provide those needed jobs.

OPPOSITION TO TITLE II

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, there can be no question about the desirability of eradicating poverty, and no question at all about the necessity of helping those who are in genuine need. Speaking as one who knows about the pangs of poverty from firsthand experience, I can say that improving the opportunities for all Americans to share in the fruits of an affluent society—and I emphasize the word opportunities—is a commendable and worthwhile national objective.

But in my view, there are serious questions about the validity of some of the premises and some of the statistics on which the war on poverty is based. And there are even more serious questions about the effectiveness of a number of phases of the effort which the Office of Economic Opportunity is making. I have serious reservations about continuing to fund some of these programs in the amounts sought, or, for that matter, in any amount whatsoever.

In many instances the results we had hoped for as a consequence of the enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964—which I supported—have not been attained. And they may not be attained, for it is doubtful to me that the OEO, or any other agency that can be devised, is going to be able to wipe out poverty in this or any other country. I believe that eradicating poverty is much more related to the individual and his own efforts than it is to federal undertakings of this nature. This is not to say that the Federal Government should not assist.

A thought-provoking article entitled

"Is United States Really Filled With Poverty?" appeared on page 50 of U.S. News & World Report for September 4, 1967, which I believe could profitably be read by any person concerned about the problem of poverty in this country. I ask unanimous consent that this article be labeled exhibit A and be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Before additional billions are voted for the war on poverty, there are many facts that should be weighed. I shall call attention in these remarks to a few of them.

The word "poverty" has emotional connotations. Our sympathies are stirred at thoughts of the less fortunate and the disadvantaged, and properly so. Providing equal opportunity for all is among the noblest ideals which we profess.

But reality should guide us, and it is my opinion that a good many misleading or at least questionable statistics have been advanced as to the number of individuals and families that actually live in poverty in America and who can be motivated to make the effort to lift themselves out of the poverty strata.

In the U.S. News article to which I referred, John B. Parrish, professor of economics at the University of Illinois, does much, I think, to put this problem in proper perspective and focus. The author has been on the Illinois faculty for 20 years and, before that, was an economist and statistician with the War Labor Board and the War Manpower Commission in Washington. For 3 years he was Chicago regional director of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

He brands as "poverty fallacy No. 1" the estimates of the number of Americans living in poverty. The figures I have heard most commonly quoted place this number at 30 to 35 million. But some members of what Dr. Parrish calls the "poverty cult"—meaning those persons, or groups, who go the farthest in advocating antipoverty measures—put the number at 40 to 50 million, and a few, using some yardstick that is utterly incomprehensible to me, would contend that as many as 80 million Americans are victims of poverty. Here is part of what Dr. Parrish wrote:

Poverty fallacy No. 1 got its big push from the 1964 report on "The Problem of Poverty in America," by the Council of Economic Advisers. CEA determined that households with less than \$3,000 annual income were in poverty. Using this income yardstick, it was determined that 20 per cent of U.S. households containing 30 million persons were in the poverty class.

The truth about poverty-income statistics is this: Under no reasonable assumptions does income below \$3,000 indicate poverty status. It may or may not, and to say otherwise, is not only erroneous but absurd.

Let's take as an example a young married couple, the Smiths. They are attending college. They constitute a statistical household. Their annual income is \$1,500 a year. They are not being "hopelessly" shut out from the good things of life. They are, along with other American youth, enjoying a rate of access to higher education greater than the youth of any country, any time, any place. They enjoy electric lighting, refrigeration,

adequate if not fancy food, and a second-hand automobile or motorcycle. They would like a new Cadillac, but will manage without one. They aren't "poor" and need no crocodile tears shed in their behalf.

At the other end of the life cycle are the Joneses. Mr. Jones has been a machinist all his life. He and Mrs. Jones had always wanted to visit the country's great national parks after the children had grown up and left. So he has opted to retire at age 60. The retirement income will come to only \$2,000 a year. Are they poor? The poverty cult says, "Yes," these people are suffering from deprivation. They have been "hopelessly" cast aside. Yet the truth is they have a small home paid for, a modest automobile paid for. They enjoy refrigeration, automatic cooking equipment, inside plumbing, TV, enough clothes to last for years—the accumulation of a lifetime. And now they propose to enjoy more leisure, in more comfort, for more years than similar working-class families of any country, any time. The Joneses think the Council of Economic Advisors is statistically wacky.

And take the Browns. They are in the middle years. Both Mr. and Mrs. Brown work. Their three children are in school. They have a modest new home, partially paid for, some savings, some insurance, good clothes—yes, and a paid-for refrigerator and TV set. They have a new car and six installments still outstanding. Mr. Brown becomes ill. Mrs. Brown quits work to take care of him. Their income drops to below \$3,000 for the year. Are they in trouble? Yes. Are they in desperate consumer poverty? Are they "hopelessly trapped?" By no means. After a tough year they will resume as members of the affluent society even by CEA's definition.

These cases could be multiplied endlessly, I think. If poverty is to be measured or defined on the basis of income and size of family alone, or the difference between low and high income brackets without taking into consideration all the other factors which are pertinent, then we will, indeed, always have poverty with us.

I do not believe that poverty can be predicated solely, or even mainly, on the basis of income or on family size. Such data form an insufficient basis on which to proceed, for they omit such estimates, which Dr. Parrish cites, as these:

Ninety-five percent of U.S. families have an adequate minimum daily diet; 99 percent of all U.S. households have adequate cooking equipment including those living in both urban and rural "ghettos"; 99 percent of U.S. households have refrigeration; 96 percent of U.S. families who want it have television; 98 percent of U.S. mothers give birth to their babies in hospitals; 95 percent of U.S. households have telephones.

Moreover, America's vast resale market makes all kind of consumer-type durable goods available to those in low-income groups at a fraction of their original cost. Refrigerators, automobiles, TV sets, record players, furniture—these and other items are sold and resold as used goods. Instead of being shut out, our low-income families are, in many instances, gaining more in the way of necessities and conveniences than they have ever had before.

I do not contend that they, the low-income families, have everything they need or should aspire to. Far from it. But I do say emphatically that it is my opinion that the bleak picture of 30 to 35 million Americans living in the depths of poverty, existing on a bare subsistence

level, is a badly overdrawn and distorted picture.

Now, let us look briefly at three of the more controversial programs of the war on poverty about which I have the strongest reservations. I refer specifically to the Job Corps, some of the community action programs, and the activities of the VISTA workers.

In the case of the Job Corps, the data are confusing and conflicting and tend generally to indicate that the program is not doing what it was intended to do; namely, to fit disadvantaged youths for holding other than make-work jobs.

Some educators and sociologists believe that the theory behind the program is faulty. They question the wisdom of removing youths from their homes and training them for situations that may or may not exist in their home communities or anywhere else.

Many who are best versed in this phase of the war on poverty believe that not enough use is being made of existing educational and vocational training facilities; that the "education" these youths are receiving is poor; and that there has not been enough involvement of State educational agencies in the program. It seems evident that there is too much overlapping and duplication of both Federal and State educational and manpower training and retraining programs.

But most seriously I question the great cost of this program when viewed in the light of the results it has produced so far.

The figures on the cost annually per enrollee have been widely discussed. The committee report on the pending bill shows that during the first 3 fiscal years \$715 million has been allocated to the Job Corps for its operation. The direct operating cost per enrollee was \$6,900 for the 1967 fiscal year for the centers in operation 9 months or more, which is under the ceiling of \$7,500 per enrollee imposed by a 1966 amendment to the 1964 act, and which the new bill would reduce to \$7,300 per enrollee.

But additional overhead and capital costs raised the cost for each enrollee by an average of \$600. The direct operating costs for men's urban centers averaged just under \$7,500 and for the women's centers just under \$8,500. The cost for the conservation centers was \$6,100 plus \$854 per conservation center enrollee, or a total of \$6,954 per enrollee.

Without making any invidious comparisons with other private educational costs, it must be obvious to all that, when no one knows exactly what results are being achieved, these costs are inordinately high.

Statements which one sees now and then in the public press and elsewhere to the effect that the youths trained in the Job Corps centers will return more than the cost of their training in the future taxes they will pay and the good they will do for society are, at best, only guesses. Assumptions that welfare costs for the youths involved will be reduced or eliminated are equally nebulous, for, as the minority report on the bill notes, many who have received public assistance receive it again after finishing their "training."

As the U.S. Chamber of Commerce

noted in its comprehensive study of the Job Corps earlier this year:

The Job Corps is doing very little directly to aid the graduates in job placement. . . . About 60 percent of the Corpsmen found their jobs themselves. Even when the Job Corps did assist in placement, responses from graduates indicate that an effort was not always made to match previous training and job specifications.¹

The chamber of commerce study made the additional point that employers hold the graduates of the Job Corps in low regard. The most disturbing result of its investigation, the chamber said, was that roughly 74 percent of the Job Corps graduates covered by the study were no longer employed in the job in which the Job Corps indicated they were placed.

Moreover, the press has reported many incidents, occurring both at the Job Corps centers and in neighboring cities and towns, in which enrollees have participated in unlawful or disruptive activities. Often it has been reported that enrollees who have committed crimes were not subjected to punishment. This has evoked criticism and antagonism, especially from citizens residing near Job Corps centers.

Many of the incidents that have marred the image of the Job Corps probably have been due to poor screening methods. The Job Corps has said that it has no way of checking whether a man is on parole or probation when he applies. They refuse to require fingerprints from enrollees—despite the fact that members of the Armed Forces and Government employees have their fingerprints taken automatically.

I do not say that the Job Corps should accept only those boys with clean records, but I do say that the Job Corps administrators should know enough about each boy's background to be able to reject him, if need be, or, once enrolled, to handle him effectively. Many of the scandals and riots that have plagued the Job Corps may have been avoided if the camp leaders had known which boys had the most serious problems and had helped them accordingly or had rejected or dismissed them.

Turning to the community action phase of the war on poverty, I have been disturbed by reports reaching me from my State that in some instances these programs are being subverted by "leadership" which seems to be ideologically opposed to what it openly refers to as "the power structure," or contemptuously calls "the establishment." The objective of some community action leaders in some communities appears mainly to be the overthrow of this "establishment."

I have had reports that in some communities persons associated with the poverty programs are openly talking of "running candidates for office," who presumably would be amenable to the points of view of "do-gooder" or extremist types of leadership, whether that fitted into a community pattern or not. I regret to say that some reports reaching me indicate that social misfits and mal-

¹ "Youth and the War on Poverty," February 24, 1967, The Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

contents have, in some cases, infiltrated the war on poverty and have become its leaders.

Local initiative and local participation in Federal programs are rightly regarded as essential in the effective development and carrying out of many such programs. But in some communities responsible leaders have shied away from having anything to do with the war on poverty. In my judgment, the OEO has failed significantly to involve progressive yet sound local leadership in many communities.

The objective in some instances appears to have been to incite hatred and anger, to build up class consciousness and to foment unrest instead of to provide constructive leadership. In one West Virginia city—Bluefield—a mimeographed notice of a community action meeting circulated in a predominantly Negro neighborhood began with these provocative words:

Are you tired of being stepped on? . . . Are you satisfied with the prevailing conditions?

I ask unanimous consent that this item be included as exhibit B at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, other inflammatory pamphlets and literature have been circulated in what seems to be a deliberate effort to take advantage of the community action programs to agitate for increased welfare benefits and to gain other similar ends. As an example, I have some literature which was recently sent to me by an elected State official and which has been circulated by poverty workers to welfare recipients. I ask unanimous consent that this literature be inserted as exhibit C at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit C.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it is fine, in theory, to involve the poor in community endeavors for their own purported betterment. But where the poor have had little experience and practice in such matters, they all too often can be misled by persons who have their own, not the poor's, interests and welfare in mind.

The issues appear to me to revolve around poor implementation of a number of the poverty programs, ineffective operation, loose administrative control, and the weaknesses inherent in the concept of such programs as the Job Corps, some of the community action programs, and some of the VISTA activities.

The legislation before us amends and revises the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. It broadens the program at the same time it purportedly seeks to correct the weaknesses to which I have referred. I do not believe that some of them have been corrected. Too often it appears that special interest groups coming into a community from outside it have seized the initiative at the local level, and that they are using the community action setup as a vehicle for their own special purposes, which all too often do not coin-

cide with the basic purposes and aims of the war on poverty. As a result, a great deal of social dissension has been stirred up, a new class-consciousness has been introduced, much public disenchantment has resulted, and, in my judgment, a great deal of money has been wasted.

I cite a letter, dated August 14, 1967, from Gov. Hulett C. Smith, of my State, to Director R. Sargent Shriver of the OEO, in which the Governor of West Virginia states that he would not give his permission or approval "today" to the VISTA and Appalachian volunteer phases of the war on poverty which he has approved for the past summer.

In his letter Governor Smith said:

Earlier this year, I approved for the second summer the placement of Appalachian Volunteers in the State of West Virginia under the auspices of the VISTA program. In so doing, I approved the return of the AV's in the face of a considerable amount of public protest from communities where they had served before, with some persons taking exception to the philosophy and activities of the group in the community, but with a majority protesting alleged immorality, uncleanness, unconventionality and personal obnoxiousness by some of the AV's working in the State during the summer of 1966.

However, it was my feeling at that time that the good being done by these young people outweighed the flaws and peccadilloes being manifested by some of them.

In recent weeks, incidents have occurred which—to be quite frank—cause me to question whether I exercised my best judgment in approving the 1967 AV contract.

Briefly related, these incidents are:

1. A group of persons identified as AV's and VISTA personnel staged a riotous all-night party on July 22 at Babcock State Park—destroying park property, interfering with the exit and entrance of other park guests, tampering with automobiles and generally disturbing the peace. This is documented in the attached report from the park superintendent, which points out that several of these persons used Federal Government automobiles, raising the possible question of misuse of U.S. Government property (as well as being abominable public relations for the national Administration). The superintendent's report has been carefully checked, and verified in almost every detail.

2. Reports from Wyoming County, West Virginia, indicate that confidence in, and effectiveness of, the VISTA-AV program has been seriously weakened by immoral conduct on the part of several of those volunteers. While these persons logically argue that their personal lives are their own affair, the fact remains that promiscuity, particularly when it crosses racial lines, is not accepted by the community as a whole and damages public respect and support for the VISTA and AV program.

3. On August 6, pickets protesting U.S. participation in the Viet Nam war staged a demonstration on the lawn of the State Capitol. The protest, which was peaceful and orderly, included five VISTA-AV workers from Raleigh County. While I affirm their right to their own views on the Vietnamese situation, the fact that they drove to Charleston in a clearly-marked U.S. Government car, which was parked near the Capitol, attracted considerable attention, as the attached State Police report reveals. The use of a Federally-owned car for such purposes certainly is open to question.

4. A respected State Senator, Carl E. Gainier, from central West Virginia has protested formally to me about the activities of VISTA and AV workers in Nicholas County. These persons apparently have called for the mass dismissal of a number of the county's elected

officials and school personnel. While such social protest might be valid, the absence of constructive alternatives to the problems of the community has led to a general feeling that the VISTA-AV group is composed of "trouble-makers" who offer only negative solutions to community problems. Charges of teaching "ideas that are Communist" have been made. Enclosed are copies of the letters outlining this problem.

5. The arrest of a group of VISTA-AV workers in a nearby county of Kentucky on charges of sedition, and their alleged possession of Communist literature and paraphernalia, has been widely reported by West Virginia news media, and has served further to undermine confidence in the VISTA-AV program.

Since I was given assurances that the 1967 Appalachian Volunteer Program would be more tightly controlled to the extent of picking persons of greater maturity and judgment and screening out those individuals whose Bohemian habits might render the program effete, I feel I have no alternative but to call this evident breach of those assurances to your attention.

It remains my contention that a program such as the Appalachian Volunteers can be a positive force for community betterment and assisting the poor to higher standards of living and aspiration.

However, it is also my contention that the poor—and the image of your office—both would be far better served if these persons were oriented in the common courtesies; inspired to set a truly good example for the people they serve in grooming, manners, dress and demeanor; and that they be impressed with the fact that they are representative of the Federal Government (and, in the eyes of many persons, government and authority in general), and as such, should try to be circumspect to the point of extreme prudence in their personal appearance, conduct and attitudes.

In conclusion, may I state that I feel the guarantees given me in the spring by VISTA officials and Mr. Milton Ogle, director of the Appalachian Volunteers program, have been disregarded or abrogated. In the light of the summer's developments, I certainly would not give my approval to such a program if it were before me today.

I believe you personally should know of these problems and incidents, for I am certain we share a desire to make the Economic Opportunity program as effective as possible in West Virginia.

The sedition charges to which Governor Smith referred made some very unfavorable national news for the poverty program. Charges that antipoverty workers were seeking the overthrow of the government of Kentucky and of Pike County were involved.

It is true that these charges of sedition were voided by a three-judge Federal court, which held that the Kentucky law on which they were based is unconstitutional. Nevertheless, a Pike County, Ky., grand jury found enough evidence to indict five persons for sedition, and a wide area of eastern Kentucky has been wracked by destructive controversy as a result of the activities of antipoverty workers.

Excuses, explanations, and defenses too frequently have been offered by the OEO as a result of criticisms and charges such as this.

The New York Times reported on September 4 that—

An inspector for the Office of Economic Opportunity has concluded that a sedition charge against Joseph Mulloy (one of the five persons involved), a poverty worker in the

mountains around Pikeville, Kentucky, is based entirely on local issues.

The news story said further that the inspector for the OEO stated that he found "no basis for the sedition charges."

This sort of defensive report has come from the OEO many times when it has been criticized, which indicates to me that the agency actually has little control at the local level over a number of activities carried on in its name.

But it will not be sufficient, in my opinion, for it to say that it has no control, or little control, over volunteer workers such as the Appalachian volunteers, for they are paid in part by poverty funds and are thoroughly identified in the public mind with the poverty program.

The five persons in Kentucky were not directly employed by the OEO, but they were identified in the public eye with its activities, and at least one of them, Mulloy, was supported in a substantial degree by Federal funds. So the damage is done. The poverty program, by the very nature of the way in which it is set up, is given another nationwide black eye.

In a feature article, the Sunday, August 27, 1967, Washington Post stated in the opening paragraph:

Are Federal tax dollars paid to anti-poverty workers subsidizing sedition in Kentucky?

This is a serious question to raise in the minds of the public which must support the antipoverty endeavors if they are to be successful.

But even more important than this, in the case of Pike County, Ky., which borders my own State, is the fact that outside agitators in the guise of seeking to help the poor natives have, instead, brought on deep dissension and set neighbor against neighbor. In the process they have helped no one. They have certainly not eradicated poverty.

There is no doubt in my mind that the persons indicted for sedition in Kentucky, along with many of those who have stirred up controversy in West Virginia and elsewhere, whether they realize it or not, are virtually revolutionaries bent on destroying the present order of society instead of trying to improve conditions within the framework that exists.

I am happy to say that Director Shriver subsequently cut off all funds for the Appalachian volunteer program in Kentucky at the request of Gov. Edward T. Breathitt following the charges of sedition.

All too often, complaints to the Office of Economic Opportunity regarding community action activities elicit only defensive responses. Charges of misconduct on the part of poverty workers are seemingly sloughed off, casually brushed aside, and made to appear as nothing out of the ordinary with regard to citizen conduct. The OEO response to Governor Smith's charges seemed to me to conform, in some respects, to such a pattern. I ask unanimous consent to insert the OEO reply as exhibit D at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit D.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I must also say, in all fairness, that I have had some good reports, as well as bad, regarding the VISTA program. I would not want it to appear that I condemn this antipoverty program in its entirety—a point about which I wish to say a few words more in order to clarify my position.

In the field of mental health in my State, for example, I am informed that Dr. Mildred Mitchell-Bateman, West Virginia's State director of mental health, has been publicly quoted in the press to the effect that the VISTA program has been effective and valuable.

In fact, she said that the work of VISTA volunteers with emotionally disturbed West Virginians, in their communities and in the State's mental hospitals, has saved the State an estimated \$486,000 in custodial care, funds that are being used to help provide better services.

Dr. Bateman said that the VISTA's also had helped to organize Boy Scout troops in rural areas for the first time, as well as day-care centers for children, tutoring programs for elementary and high school pupils and services for the retarded.

Dr. Bateman said:

In all these activities, the VISTAs are training local people to take over when they leave. This is really a program in which VISTAs try to work themselves out of a job.

Governor Smith, I believe, concurs in this evaluation.

However, I have received many complaints from dependable sources concerning the activities of some of the VISTA workers. Just the other day, on September 22 to be exact, through questions addressed to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] I expressed some concern and reservations anent VISTA. The Senator subsequently, on September 25, submitted for the RECORD certain documentation in support of VISTA, including exhibits attesting to the value of VISTA's mental health program in West Virginia.

I was, of course, aware of the complimentary reports concerning the mental health program, having heard directly from Dr. Mildred Mitchell-Bateman, West Virginia's director of mental health, and from a few county directors of mental health programs in the State.

But the part does not make the whole, and I ask unanimous consent that there be printed, as exhibit E at the conclusion of my remarks, a sampling of the correspondence which has reached my office from so many people of my State and which reflects in the opinion of many persons, a poor image of VISTA workers in general, as observed in West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit E.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, these reports include, for example:

First, Strong criticism of the VISTA program in his county by the sheriff of Raleigh County and a plea for an investigation of the actions of VISTA workers. Seven months later, after what

he characterizes as a "job of whitewashing" by OEO officials, he still urged investigation.

Second. An expression of belief by a well-known real estate operator that VISTA workers 18 or 19 years old, untrained, and "looking in most cases more in need than our own people," cannot accomplish much in the promotion of a "better life for those in the rural areas," and a request that something "be done about this reckless spending of our tax money."

Third. An expression of alarm by a member of the West Virginia Senate who characterizes the VISTA workers in his district as "a bunch of improperly misguided misfits who are endangering our concept of law and order in this Nation."

Fourth. A protest by a high school librarian in Nicholas County of the "smirching of our schools with dope raids, long-haired, rude, and untidy students, moral problems, and the like," resulting from the presence of anti-poverty workers, who sought the forced resignation of duly appointed school authorities.

Fifth. A report by a grocery store manager of VISTA workers headquartered in Mingo County, driving a Government car, exhibiting rude and intimidating manners in his place of business.

Sixth. A request from a postmaster that an effort be made to "get these people—VISTA workers—out of here," since "they are telling the people here that they are not getting what is due them."

Seventh. A report by the chief of police of Huntington concerning attempts to "set up black power movement meetings" by individuals believed to be OEO employees from New York City and Norman, Okla. If OEO, they may or may not be VISTA workers; OEO has not reported the facts.

Eighth. Reports by an outstanding lawyer regarding slovenly, unclean VISTA employees inciting political disorder and stirring up dissatisfaction against "the taxpayers of this country" who are paying the bill and "have a right to expect better treatment."

Ninth. A sampling of letters from interested citizens, who will be identified by their initials.

In summary, the picture of VISTA in West Virginia is one of certain individuals who have come to our State from other parts of the country, some of whom are carelessly dressed and look worse than even the poorest of our people, and who have sometimes served to create and foment unrest, dissatisfaction, and trouble. If VISTA is to continue, its image and its programs would be far better served if these workers were, in the words of the Governor, oriented in the common courtesies; inspired to set a truly good example for the people they serve in grooming, manners, dress, and demeanor; and circumspect to the point of extreme prudence in their personal appearance, conduct, and attitudes.

I have had excellent reports on the adult basic education program, and the Headstart program, both of which are other components of the community ac-

² *Charleston Gazette*, p. 3, August 23, 1967.

tion phase of the legislation before us. The basic criticism I have heard regarding Headstart is that it should be under the jurisdiction of local school systems rather than under community action direction.

As the adult education effort has been conducted in my State and elsewhere it seems to have fortified and strengthened existing adult education programs and contributed to improving the lot of the undereducated.

More than 10,000 persons have been involved in this program in my State in the past 3 years, and our State department of education reports that the overall average of public education in the State will be increased by as much as two full grade levels as a result of the program.

For example, I have been advised by Mr. James Basil Deck, State supervisor of the adult basic education program for the West Virginia Department of Education, that 4,800 individuals have moved off the welfare rolls during the past 2 years, these individuals having gone through the adult basic education class. Many have just learned to read and write and have upgraded educational skills and have been able to move out and get jobs. Mr. Deck advised me that there are 6,071 AFDCUP participants in the adult basic education classes this year; 846 are in high school equivalency classes; and 451 are in vocational classes, making a total of 7,368.

I am informed that there were over 16,000 students in classes during the past year and that it is expected to be about the same number this year. Mr. Deck stated that many of these individuals take the general adult development tests for high school equivalency. Moreover, he stated that 25 students in classes have enrolled in college this year. So, from the reports I have received, an excellent job is being done in the adult education effort in West Virginia, an effort which improves basic education skills or upgrades skills to prepare for jobs. This is the kind of program that I wholeheartedly support.

I have had some equally good reports concerning the Neighborhood Youth Corps, which OEO farms out to the Department of Labor.

Mr. President, I voted for the original economic opportunity legislation. The eradication of poverty where it is real and where the objective can be accomplished effectively is a worthwhile goal of which I approve and for the achievement of which I supported the original Economic Opportunity Act. I do feel, however, that the war on poverty needs a full-scale, in-depth inquiry and investigation. I am fully cognizant of the work which Senator CLARK's subcommittee has so ably performed in conducting hearings on this bill, and I would say nothing in derogation of this work. But I do not believe that this is sufficient. It is my opinion that a thorough and comprehensive reappraisal of the war on poverty is needed, and I think that the kind of scrutiny required can only be provided by competent and trained persons skilled in investigative and auditing techniques.

I feel strongly that many of the community action programs have not been properly administered, properly directed, properly supervised, or properly audited. I also believe that if such an in-depth study of these programs were to be conducted, many disturbing, and even shocking, facts would be brought to light with regard to how these programs have been mismanaged, with a concomitant wasteful expenditure of Federal funds. Moreover, I am convinced in my own mind that some of the poverty workers have been utilized by misguided persons and even out-and-out revolutionaries, who have sought to achieve ends that have little or nothing to do with the stamping out of poverty. I am deeply disturbed at the many indications that some programs have been utilized to foment social protest, civil rights disturbances, and anti-Vietnam war demonstrations.

I was happy to support the amendment offered by Senator PROUTY on Friday, which would order the General Accounting Office to investigate the Office of Economic Opportunity and its local agencies in the war on poverty. I believe that this type of investigation by the GAO will help to determine the real efficiency of the administration of OEO programs and the extent to which such programs achieve the objectives as intended by Congress. I have a feeling that some of the shortcomings of the anti-poverty programs in the District of Columbia may be indicative of what is taking place throughout many areas of the country.

The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, of which I am chairman, has information of interest in this regard.

The subcommittee has received information that indicates a grave weakness in the financial management of records and expenses maintained by one of the programs in the District of Columbia. In 1 month the organization responsible to the Washington Welfare Association claimed expenditures for positions which were vacant during that period. Expenditures for group health insurance premiums had also been overstated; bills for merchandise purchased by a former employee after his dismissal in the previous year had also been claimed as an expense reimbursable by the United Planning Organization.

As a further illustration of lack of adequate financial control and laxity in the management of the program there existed in one instance unsupported billings from a local store which had been paid and claimed as an expense, an excessive retroactive salary payment had been made to an employee, expenditures were repeatedly charged to incorrect program components, personnel costs have been overstated by 1 day for all employed positions of another development program, and in several instances commitments incurred during the prior contract period had been paid from current contract funds.

Other reported deficiencies showed reimbursement twice to the activity for expenses that had been incurred during a period in calendar year 1966. Another instance of questionable practice concerned the accountant-office manager

and her assistant, in that each received, in addition to her regular salary, one half of the funds available for a part-time accountant position in another activity of the area.

The reported deficiencies also revealed that inventory records for equipment furnished the area have not been maintained as required by agreements with the United Planning Organization.

With further regard to the additional payments to the accountant-office manager and clerk-typist, the two employees receive monthly salaries of \$667 and \$401 respectively, and each person was reportedly receiving an additional \$162 per month for performing the duties of the part-time workers in another development program. Justification of the additional payment to the two individuals related to the fact that each worked 10 hours per week in addition to her regular full-time working hours, and officials recognized the practice was not desirable but said they were not able to find the qualified neighborhood residents to fill the positions.

Another questionable practice concerns the use of poverty funds to pay certain administrative expenses of the credit union in the area rather than using the proceeds of credit union operations to pay those expenses, as is customary. There are over 1,200 members with share accounts totaling over \$86,000. It is reported that without the aid of poverty funds, the credit union would be facing financial difficulty. For example, in February 1967, it cost more than \$2,000 to make loans of \$6,802. Moreover, dividends which are now paid regularly could not be continued if earnings from less than \$100,000 of capital were required to pay expenses at the rate of \$22,509 for 10 months. Loan delinquencies of the union are said to have been increasing over the period of its operations. For example, on March 31, 1967, delinquent loans totaled \$8,612, 11.2 percent of loans outstanding of \$76,824, whereas on December 31, 1964, delinquent loans were only 3.9 percent of loans outstanding.

Another reported irregularity related to the child day care and Headstart programs. It was reported that the Office of Economic Opportunity income guidelines were not adhered to. A legal requirement of the 1964 act is that not more than 10 percent of families with children receiving day care who are enrolled in Headstart may have incomes higher than levels to be set under the act by OEO. It was found in this area that the act was not observed in some cases. At one day care program in the area, 16 of the 90 children were from overincome families. It was noted that only eight of the 16 children whose incomes exceeded the OEO guidelines were charged a fee as required by the act.

Of the 30 children enrolled in two Headstart classes in the area in September 1966, it was found that six of the children's families had incomes at the time of enrollment which exceeded eligibility guidelines.

Mr. President, I shall probably have more to say, at a future date, about poverty programs in the District of Colum-

bia area to which I have referred. I have merely alluded to the situation in that particular area of the District of Columbia at this time for the purpose of indicating the need, in my opinion, for a thorough investigation of the poverty program in urban communities and elsewhere.

Mr. President, I have discussed certain aspects of the war on poverty as we have seen it operate since its beginning. I call attention to the fact that the authorization in title I is in excess of the administration bill in the amount of \$198 million for fiscal year 1968.

However, the Senate is confronted, in the massive bill before us, with a radically new proposal to spend another \$2.5 billion in grants, and \$300 million in loans on a crash program which is estimated to create 500,000 new jobs.

Although I respect the sincerity of the distinguished Senator whose name is associated with it, I believe his multi-billion-dollar proposal is the wrong program and comes at the wrong time.

In its haste, the proposal attacks the wrong horn of the manpower dilemma faced by the country.

There is no shortage of jobs in the United States today. The total work force, as of July 1967, was 82.9 million. The number of unemployed persons was 3.2 million, or 4.1 percent. I think it is important to note that the term "unemployed" as used here can be misleading. For example, persons are considered unemployed who, for an entire week, did not work at all, were able to work and available for work and would have looked for work except that: First, they were waiting to return to a job from which they were laid off, or second, waiting to report to a new wage or salary job scheduled to start within the following 30 days—and were not in school during the week, or third, believed no work to be available in their line of work or in the community. Moreover, persons under AFDCUP and working in work experience programs are primarily counted as unemployed.

Agricultural workers and construction workers are counted among the unemployed if they have registered as seeking employment. Others unemployed and not seeking work cannot be counted.

Thousands on thousands of good high-paying jobs are going begging every day in every city in every State simply because there are not enough trained or qualified people to fill them and, in some instances, because there are people who do not want to work.

I am advised that, at the end of July, there were, for example, over 343,000 unfilled job openings listed at over 2,000 State public employment offices across the country. These job openings were in 150 major employment areas.

Now, why do we not concentrate on filling those job openings, before we create another half million?

In fact, the 343,000 job openings tell us only part of the job vacancy story.

The total figure on job vacancies—listed and unlisted—is probably closer to the million mark, because information is not available as to the number of job openings nationwide. But this is only part of the story. In many areas of the coun-

try, Federal job training openings are going begging as well. In fact, as of last July 31, there were nearly 50,000 MDTA unfilled openings in these programs in the Nation's 48 largest cities.

Is the Congress seriously supposed to authorize the creation of half a million new jobs when one million jobs have no takers and 50,000 training opportunities are being ignored?

The second major defect in the proposal is that it would certainly result in a number of cities quickly creating jobs—jobs they do not need, jobs they do not want, but jobs which will be produced simply because Uncle Sam is footing the bill with hundreds of millions in ready cash.

The kinds of jobs cities will create, for the most part, will be pseudo-jobs. They will be makework jobs, shadow jobs, deadend jobs. They will be manual or unskilled jobs which require little, if any, training. They will be under-skilled jobs with no future, with no possible development, with no real base upon which a human being may build a career.

Such jobs will have the effect of further isolating the poor person from society. He will not only be poor; he will also have a poor man's job. This is exactly the kind of situation which we should all be trying to reverse today. We should try to break the cycle of poverty, not freeze poverty into job categories.

The 1967 Manpower Report of the President stated clearly the kinds of jobs our economy must fill if it is to continue the seven unprecedented years of prosperity the country has enjoyed.

The Manpower Report stated:

At the end of 1966, the most widespread shortages existed for industrial production workers . . . machinists, machine operators, tool makers, aircraft mechanics, model and pattern makers, assemblers, electricians and welders, and for engineers, draftsmen, mathematicians and health service workers.

I do not care how crashing a crash program is, or how many billions may be poured into it; it is not possible to create skilled, trained, and qualified workers for such jobs overnight. No amount of money will turn an under-educated, unskilled, unmotivated ghetto dweller into a skilled employee by providing him with a 1- or 2-year leaf-raking assignment.

You must train and prepare those who will man and guide the American economic system of tomorrow.

And that leads me to the third major defect in the emergency proposal.

What 3 million unemployed in our country need today is not just a job—but a job with a bright future.

The unemployed need education for a job. They need to be taught how to hold a job; how to perform under varying job conditions; how to shift to a new and perhaps more promising occupation when new opportunity arises.

And if we look at the record of the Congress and the administration these last few years, we will find that there already exists a comprehensive series of opportunity programs which, if they are properly administered, can serve as blueprints for the social and economic rehabilitation of millions of poor people.

The administration's opportunity programs are basically geared and intended to raise people to the level where they can become productive Americans, rather than dependent Americans.

The Manpower Development and Training Act, for example, is a good illustration of the kind of program which invests in human beings by training or retraining people for better jobs. Since it was inaugurated, almost one million men and women have received job training with Federal help. In the past the MDTA program has focused more and more on the disadvantaged, with positive and fruitful results.

This is the type of program we should be improving, rather than setting up parallel or conflicting programs.

Let us not launch new programs until we have corrected the flaws in the old ones, and as I have already stated, there is much work to be done in correcting the existing programs.

My fourth major objection to title II of the bill is that it is clearly inflationary—and that is another thing we do not need in our present state of economic affairs.

Almost \$3 billion poured into 500,000 jobs of very slight productivity is either going to give us a solid dose of new inflation or force the President and the Congress to raise taxes even higher than now proposed.

The total national debt at the end of fiscal year 1967 was \$326 billion. According to the testimony of the Director of the Budget and the Secretary of the Treasury before the House Ways and Means Committee, the anticipated deficit for fiscal year 1968 may go as high as \$29 billion. I do not believe that it is wise to compound this dangerous deficit with an additional \$1.3 billion required, by title II of the bill before us, for fiscal year 1968. This is in excess of the administration's request, and if it stays in the bill, the bill will never reach the President's desk for his signature, considering the temper of the other body.

At a time when the President is requesting the enactment of legislation providing for a surtax on personal and corporation incomes, it would be a serious mistake to launch this new and costly program.

My fifth objection to title II is that it is extraordinarily vague, ambiguous, and unclear. Such a new and costly program as would be envisioned by title II should have the most thorough study and should involve the most careful and detailed analysis before enactment. Exhaustive hearings would be required. Even if we were living in a time when such a crash emergency program were needed, in my judgment, the concepts and outlines of such a program would have to be much more concrete, more carefully evaluated, studied, and delineated than is the case here.

As Senators DOMINICK and FANNIN stated in their supplemental views on the bill:

Title II was reported to the Floor without hearings.

Senator MURPHY, in his supplemental views stated, with regard to title II:

Here again we seem to be faced with a lack of planning, a lack of definition, a lack of

guidelines, and an absence of complete preparation. In good conscience, I cannot agree to spending \$2.8 billion of taxpayers' dollars on such a program.

Senator GRIFFIN, in his supplemental views, referred to title II as "an unfortunate example of hasty, unsound congressional reaction to the riots." He said:

It is as extravagant in its promise as it is vague in its operation. The committee has had no real opportunity to consider the proposal in depth. The record contains no statement of the administration's views regarding the merits of the program, its effect on the poverty war or on the budget. How such a program would relate to ongoing job creation and training programs has not been explored. . . . Instead of holding hearings, the subcommittee released a booklet entitled "Emergency Employment Act—Background Materials." The booklet is supposed to establish the need for title II. In fact, however, the material also emphasizes that superficial, short-term make-work programs do not solve long-term unemployment problems, and that efforts should be directed toward training and education. As written, the title would constitute a virtual abdication of congressional responsibility; it would delegate almost unlimited authority and discretion to the Secretary of Labor.

Finally, there are some real basic philosophical questions we have got to ask ourselves about such a program as would be inaugurated by title II. Is the country ready to give a permanent job to anyone who cannot or will not find work elsewhere?

Once we get people into a program such as this, how do we get them out into productive employment?

Will we ever get them out?

Would we not create a new public welfare bureaucracy?

We will be paying people, essentially for doing nothing productive. They will become an added, and possibly, permanent public burden.

Title II would authorize an expenditure of \$1 billion in grants in fiscal year 1968 and \$1.5 billion in fiscal year 1969. If past experience is worth anything, every Senator knows that these programs mushroom like the prophet's gourd overnight. Two years hence we could expect the Congress to be asked for an expanded program—one which would perhaps double that which is envisioned in title II. If this country were in the midst of a depression, a crash program of this kind might be justified. One thing is abundantly clear. The sense of the Congress and the Nation today is that this program is not necessary and not wise.

I urge the Senate to take action to delete this title from the bill.

Mr. President, I have not addressed my remarks to the pending Prouty amendment; but if the Prouty amendment is agreed to, then the motion which I have offered, the effect of which would be to delete title II, would be out of the question, because the question would then recur on my motion as amended by Senator Prouty's substitute. My motion would no longer be amendable.

Therefore, I hope Senators will support me in voting against the Prouty amendment and against all other amendments to my motion, so that we can have

a final, clear-cut vote on my motion to recommit with instructions to delete title II in its entirety.

EXHIBIT A

[From U.S. News & World Report] IS UNITED STATES REALLY FILLED WITH POVERTY?—A LOOK AT THE FACTS

(NOTE.—How many Americans are really in poverty? Thirty million? Eighty million? Or only a handful? This article, written for "U.S. News & World Report," is based on a study of poverty—and of the "poverty cult" that has developed in this era.)

(By John B. Parrish, professor of economics, University of Illinois)

When future historians write the history of the 1960s, there will be no more extraordinary episode in their accounts than the rise of America's "new poverty" cult. Intellectuals from every social-science discipline, every religious denomination, every political and social institution have climbed aboard the poverty bandwagon.

This article is concerned with a few fundamental questions: How did the new cult get started? What are its claims? Does the economic evidence support the claims? Are we moving toward a new and better social order or toward social chaos?

After a decade of exploring every nook and cranny of the poverty world, the "new poverty" cult has settled on a few basic doctrines which together form a dogma that apparently must be accepted on faith. These claims may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. The economic process, which in earlier years brought affluence to a majority of Americans, recently has slowed up and apparently stopped. As a result, a large minority of Americans are "hopelessly" trapped below the poverty line.

2. The size of this poverty population is "massive," and may be increasing. Minimum estimates place the number at 30 million, maximum at nearly 80 million.

3. Despite its great size, the poverty population is hidden away—"invisible," unknown, unwanted, unaided, helpless.

4. The hard core of the "other America" is the Negro. Because of racial discrimination, he has been unable to participate in economic progress. He is frustrated, embittered, forced to live outside the affluent society of the majority.

5. The "new poverty" can only be eradicated by massive, federal social-action programs involving income maintenance, self-help, education and training, in a milieu of racial integration, the latter voluntary if possible, compulsory if necessary.

Does the evidence on diffusion of economic well-being support the "new poverty" cult? Has diffusion mysteriously slowed to a halt, leaving millions "hopelessly trapped"? Are 30 to 80 million suffering acute deprivation in today's America? The plain truth is there is no basis in fact for the "new poverty" thesis. The high priests of the poverty religion have been exchanging each other's misinformation. Let's look briefly at some illustrative evidence.

Diet. The diet of U.S. families has continued to improve steadily over time until today at least 95 per cent, perhaps 96 per cent or 97 per cent of all families have an adequate minimum daily intake of nutrients.

Automatic cooking equipment. Are 20 per cent, perhaps 40 per cent of U.S. families without decent equipment with which to prepare this food intake? No. As a matter of fact, 99 per cent of all U.S. households have automatic cooking equipment, including most of those families living in rural and urban "ghettos." The diffusion has been consistent and persistent over the last six decades.

Refrigeration. Could it be that millions of American families are experiencing dull and

dreary meals because they have no way to preserve foods and beverages against spoilage? No. About 99 per cent of all U.S. families have purchased electric or gas refrigerators. It is reasonable to assume that they know how to operate them, even in the "ghettos."

Communication. Are millions of America's poor shut off from all contact with the rest of their affluent countrymen—alone, frustrated, in that "other world" of poverty isolation? At last count, the diffusion of TV sets had reached 92 per cent of all U.S. households, providing instant access to entertainment, news, sports, cultural enrichment. Since a small per cent of middle, and upper-income families who can afford TV have chosen not to buy, the per cent of families having TV who want it must be around 96 or 97 per cent—a diffusion achieved in just 15 years.

Medical aid. Have the "new hopeless poor" found the doors to modern medical service "slammed shut," forcing them to rely on quack remedies, superstition, midwives, or to die alone and unattended?

In 1910, only one of every 10 American families had access to hospitals for childbirth. The diffusion since then has been spectacular and persistent for all groups, including nonwhites. By 1960, over 97 per cent of all American women had their babies born in hospitals. Today it is somewhere between 98 per cent and 99 per cent.

The luxury of telephone service. Telephone service is ordinarily not a rock-bottom consumer necessity. It is useful and convenient but not an absolute requirement, as was demonstrated during the Great Depression of the 1930s when the percent of families with telephones declined.

Yet today nearly 90 per cent of all U.S. households have telephones. Since there are still a few pockets of unavailability, it is reasonable to conclude that close to 95 per cent of all U.S. households in availability areas who would like this luxury actually enjoy it.

Some clues to how much poverty in United States

| Percentage of families having— | 1920 | 1965 |
|----------------------------------|------|------|
| Minimum adequate diet, or better | 50 | 95 |
| Electric or gas stoves | 28 | 99 |
| Electric refrigerators | 1 | 99 |
| Television sets | 0 | 92 |
| Telephones in home | 35 | 98 |
| Children born in hospitals | 20 | 98 |

¹ In metropolitan areas.

Source: Study by Prof. John B. Parrish, University of Illinois.

THREE POVERTY FALLACIES

The foregoing illustrative evidence raises an interesting question: How can the "massive" group of America's "hopeless poor" buy so much with so little? Perhaps this basic question can be put another way: How could the poverty intellectuals be so wrong? The answer is actually very simple. The intellectuals have chosen to be wrong. Most members of the "new poverty" cult are quite well-trained in statistics. Some are acknowledged experts. They know better. But, for the sake of the "new poverty" religion, they have chosen to accept three poverty fallacies.

The "new poverty" cult has built much of its case on family-income statistics. Some technical matters aside, there is nothing wrong with these statistics, per se. But there is something wrong, very much wrong, with their use. It is impossible for anyone adequately to interpret them in terms of average family economic well-being.

Poverty fallacy No. 1 got its big push from the 1964 report on "The Problem of Poverty in America" by the Council of Economic Advisers. CEA determined that households with less than \$3,000 annual income were in poverty. Using this income yardstick, it was de-

terminated that 20 per cent of U.S. households containing 30 million persons were in the poverty class.

This report provided a wonderful takeoff point for poverty statisticians. With 30 million to build on, it was not difficult to find millions of additional families who should be added to the poverty population. The poverty numbers game became quite exciting. Who could count the most? Honors so far have gone to those claiming nearly 80 million. A majority of cult members have settled for a more modest 40 to 50 million.

The truth about poverty-income statistics is this: Under no reasonable assumptions does income below \$3,000 indicate poverty status. It may or may not, and to say otherwise is not only erroneous but absurd.

Let's take as an example a young married couple, the Smiths. They are attending college. They constitute a statistical household. Their annual income is \$1,500 a year. They are not being "hopelessly" shut out from the good things of life. They are, along with other American youth enjoying a rate of access to higher education greater than the youth of any country, any time, any place. They enjoy electric lighting, refrigeration, adequate if not fancy food, and a second-hand automobile or motorcycle. They would like a new Cadillac, but will manage without one. They aren't "poor" and need no crocodile tears shed in their behalf.

At the other end of the life cycle are the Joneses. Mr. Jones has been a machinist all his life. He and Mrs. Jones had always wanted to visit the country's great national parks after the children had grown up and left. So he has opted to retire at age 60. The retirement income will come to only \$2,000 a year. Are they poor? The poverty cult says, "Yes," these people are suffering from deprivation. They have been "hopelessly" cast aside. Yet the truth is they have a small home paid for, a modest automobile paid for. They enjoy refrigeration, automatic cooking equipment, inside plumbing, TV, enough clothes to last for years—the accumulation of a lifetime. And now they propose to enjoy more leisure, in more comfort, for more years than similar working-class families of any country, any time. The Joneses think the Council of Economic Advisers is statistically wacky.

And take the Browns. They are in the middle years. Both Mr. and Mrs. Brown work. Their three children are in school. They have a modest new home, partially paid for, some savings, some insurance, good clothes—yes, and a paid-for refrigerator and TV set. They have a new car and six installments still outstanding. Mr. Brown becomes ill. Mrs. Brown quits work to take care of him. Their income drops to below \$3,000 for the year. Are they in trouble? Yes. Are they in desperate consumer poverty? Are they "hopelessly trapped?" By no means. After a tough year they will resume as members of the affluent society even by CEA's definition.

ECONOMIC WELL-BEING: "CUMULATIVE"

These illustrations could be multiplied many times. Cross-section household-income statistics are a very inappropriate yardstick with which to measure economic well-being, which is a longitudinal and cumulative process.

Let's return for a moment to the telephone as a luxury—or at least a semiluxury—consumer good. Now take the desperately poor on whom the doors of affluence have presumably been "slammed shut." Now take the "poorest of the poor"—those at the very rock bottom of the income scale, those desperately deprived households earning less than \$500 a year. You just can't get much poorer than that.

Now observe that nearly 60 per cent of these poorest of the poor had telephone service in 1965. How could this be? Why would families presumably facing the grim

miseries of malnutrition order telephone service? And, if we make allowance for the availability factor and the "can afford but don't want" factor, then it is reasonable to conclude that 70 to 80 per cent of America's poorest poor had telephones in 1965.

If this is the "new poverty," it is apparently not too severe. How to explain this paradox of income poverty, consumer-goods affluence? The answer is quite simple. Income data are a very bad measure of economic well-being. The Smiths, the Joneses, the Browns, all had telephone service even though the CEA's income statistics put them in the "poverty class."

There is a second big fallacy in the "new poverty" claims, and in some respects an inexcusable one. The poverty cult measures the economic well-being of families at all income levels by determining what they can buy with their income at current retail prices. In fact, the poverty cult makes much out of the fact that because of the greed of retail merchants and the gullibility and lack of buying savvy on the part of many poor buyers, the "new poor" actually pay more for the same goods than the affluent classes. This is hogwash.

The truth is, America's low-income classes have access to a low-price consumer-goods market in which prices are a fraction of published retail prices, and in which the purchasing power of "poor" dollars is multiplied many times. This discount market yields levels of consumption far above that indicated by retail prices.

As the poor could explain to CEA and the poverty intellectuals, this market is America's enormously big resale market—the world's largest. Every year, from 25 to 65 per cent of many consumer durable-goods purchases involve second or third-hand goods moving in established trade or in informal, person-to-person channels.

Take as an example a popular consumer durable good, the electric refrigerator. In 1923, this appliance was a new item. In current dollars, it cost around \$900. Its capacity was small, averaging less than 6 cubic feet. It averaged only six years of service life, or about \$150 a year. There were too few produced, and service was too short for a resale market. Only the rich could afford a refrigerator.

Today a good new refrigerator can be purchased for about \$300. Its capacity will average about 10 cubic feet. Service life will be around 18 years. The average replacement year currently is around 10. So the first buyer pays about \$30 a year, minus trade-in. Resale value will be about \$50. This will permit the second buyer to purchase eight years of the same quality of refrigeration for about \$6 a year. The low-income buyer, not particular about the latest style, has expanded his purchasing power 500 per cent over that of the first high-income buyer.

Today's low-income, "new poverty" buyer has purchasing power 25 times greater than that of the rich buyer of 1923. America's consumer durable-goods market is operating under a law of accelerating diffusion. America's low-income families are not being shut out. They are being pulled into affluence at an ever-increasing rate.

There is a big, hidden, tertiary consumer-goods market not measured even by retail or resale price statistics. This is the intergenerational movement of goods accumulated over time and handed down or distributed from one generation to another. In an affluent society this becomes a very large market. Sewing machines, automobiles, electric irons, kitchenware, furniture, silverware, dinnerware, bicycles, etc.—all these provide an enormous source of consumption for all income classes, including the poor.

GROWTH OF NO-COST GOODS, SERVICES

If ignoring the durable-goods resale market is inexcusable, the failure of the poverty cult

to take account of the rapid growth in low-cost or no-cost goods and services in America is well-nigh incredible. It is incredible because much of it has been brought about by the very federal agencies whose economists have been among the high priests of the poverty cult. This failure constitutes poverty fallacy No. 3.

To illustrate: Nearly 90 per cent of all Negro births today are in hospitals. Yet the U.S. House Committee on Education and Labor in 1964 said half the Negroes in America were suffering from acute poverty, measured by income statistics. How can so many poor afford so much medical service? For two reasons: First, as already noted, the income data are faulty. But more to the point here, almost every urban community has free or very low-cost medical services for low-income families. In fact, surveys show that in some communities the lowest-income families have more medical checkups, vaccinations, chest X rays, eye examinations than some higher-income groups.

The number of low-cost food programs has been growing rapidly. For example, the national school-lunch program provided low-cost noon meals for nearly 20 million children in 1967. The food-stamp plan provided low-cost food for 1 million persons in 1966, and was scheduled to rise to 2 million in 1967. The low-cost milk plan—along with school lunch—accounted for 5 per cent of total U.S. nonfarm fluid-milk consumption in 1966, and would have expanded even more in 1967 had not cutbacks been ordered because of Vietnam.

The total number of low-income persons reached by various food-subsidy programs came to nearly 30 million in 1966, or precisely the number of persons classified as poor in 1964 by the Council of Economic Advisers. Since many of CEA's 30 million didn't belong in the poverty classification in the first place, some questions may well be raised as to who and how many poor have been "forgotten."

If the evidence suggests the "new poverty" intellectuals have grossly exaggerated the extent of poverty in America, can we now sit back comfortably and forget the poverty claims? Unfortunately, we cannot.

SOME DISTURBING TRENDS

There are some very disturbing social trends which have accompanied the spread of affluence. Even more disturbing is the possibility that the federal antipoverty programs may be causally as well as associational related to these developments. We may be headed not toward a great new society, but toward social chaos. Let's look briefly at six problem areas, all of them interrelated:

1. The various federal-State income-maintenance programs seem to have generated an explosion of illegitimacy in America that will have far-reaching consequences for the future. The illegitimacy rate has doubled in the last few years, until today 1 out of 12 Americans is born illegitimate. At recent rates of growth, every tenth American by the early 1970's will be born out of wedlock.

2. Related to illegitimacy is the long-run growth in households managed only by females, a large proportion subsidized by various federal-State aid programs. Today in America, 1 out of 10 households is fatherless. There is every reason to expect this to rise in the future. Among Negro families the percentage is already 1 out of 4.

3. A particularly disconcerting development over and above trends for the whole population is the upsurge in the number and proportion of unwanted and unguided Negro youth. Today 1 out of 4 Negroes is born illegitimate. In some sections of large urban areas the percentage is very much higher. If the trends of 1950-64 continue, then by 1975 about one third of all Negro youth born in the U.S. will be born outside normal family-life patterns. They will be arriving

at the teen ages not suffering from malnutrition or abject consumer-goods poverty, but from acute social and intellectual poverty. The future consequences for the rest of the urban populations, both white and nonwhite, will be considerable.

4. Related to but not solely derived from problems 1 to 3 is the rise of juvenile delinquency. The rate has doubled in the last decade. How long can society tolerate such a rate of growth? At least in part, the steady climb of delinquency may be due not to poverty, but to an affluent society—more leisure, more spending money, fewer responsibilities, less motivation, failure of rehabilitative programs.

5. The diffusion of affluency has been accompanied not only by rising juvenile delinquency but by a rising rate of general crime. The rate rose by one third, 1960 to 1964. The law-abiding segment of the population has an ever-increasing struggle to avoid the depredations of criminals, the latter experiencing not acute deprivation but the encouragement of easy and profitable pickings of the affluent state.

6. Perhaps no problem illustrates so well the failure of the poverty intellectuals than the upward drift of youth unemployment. Very strenuous and dedicated efforts have been made by the U.S. Congress to do something about youth unemployment. A great diversity of programs has been attempted. Recent conditions of tight, full employment have provided a favorable labor market. Yet the "new poverty" intellectuals have only failure to show for their efforts. Youth unemployment has not retreated. For nearly 20 years it has shown a rise—slight for white youth, sharply upward for nonwhite youth.

Could it be the "new poverty" cult has been fighting the wrong war? Measured by consumer-goods yardsticks, less than 5 per cent of U.S. households are below the poverty line, and the percentage continues to decline.

There is a war to be fought, however. There are disturbing signs of deep social problems around us, and more on the horizon. The most rapidly growing segment of the American population is the illegitimate segment. The largest proportion of this "other America" is Negro.

Who is to discipline, guide, train this growing army of unwanted, unmotivated? The ordinary family influences, so strong among earlier ethnic groups immigrating to U. S. cities, appears to be lacking. In fact, such influences appear to be declining and may well be disintegrating.

The churches, historically an important institution in shaping constructive life patterns, appear to have limited and perhaps declining influence.

The "new social problem" is being dumped onto the public schools and the police. But schools cannot discipline—and without discipline they cannot educate.

The police can discipline—but they cannot educate and motivate. Racial integration efforts have created new antagonisms to add to the problems of the already overburdened schools and police.

PHONY STATISTICS: HARDLY CONVINCING

The poverty intellectuals say they are building a great new society. Perhaps they are. But phony statistics are hardly convincing proof. Perhaps they should take a second look. They may well be rushing us pell-mell toward social chaos. The dogmas of the poverty cult may not prove as effective as expected.

Efforts to force racial integration may bring about as many disruptive as constructive influences. We may well need some new institutions designed for the problems of an affluent society of the present, not the poverty society of the past.

If this conclusion is even partially correct, then we should be about the task before it is too late. It may be already too late.

EXHIBIT B

IT'S TIME FOR A CHANGE IN NORTHSIDE!!

Are you tired of being stepped on?
Are you satisfied with the prevailing conditions in *Northside*?
Community action can help you!!
Come to the Community action meeting.
Date: Tuesday July 18, 1967.
Time: 7:30 P.M.
Place: Presbyterian Church—North Mercer Street.

PROPOSED AGENDA

Election of officers.
Committee reports.
Recreation center.
Representatives to the Board of Directors.
Fund Raising Projects.
Freedom School . . . and anything else that's on your mind . . .
"United We Stand Divided We Fall."

EXHIBIT C

MORE MONEY—NOW!

All across the nation, more and more welfare recipients are now getting more money for their living needs because they are now members of the welfare/rights movement.

How are you doing? Are you getting more? You can get legal help and a voice that counts in getting more welfare money.

Find out! Write, phone, or come in and see us, at your local Welfare Rights Office.

GOALS FOR A NATIONAL WELFARE RIGHTS MOVEMENT

OUR RIGHTS ARE NOT FOR SALE

We are not willing to sell our rights as American citizens: Our rights to *dignity*, our rights to *justice*, our rights to *democracy*—for the food, clothing, and shelter which our *age*, our *disability*, the *absence or death of our family's breadwinner*, our *lack of economic opportunity*, our *society*—have made us unable to provide.

Based on Report of Workshop No. 2, Goals for a National Welfare Rights Movement, First National Welfare Rights Meeting, Chicago, Illinois, August 6 and 7, 1966.

Our goal is: *Jobs or income now!* Decent jobs with adequate wages for those who can work, adequate income for those who cannot work.

Our goals are:

1. Adequate income: A system which guarantees enough money for all Americans to live dignified lives above the level of poverty.
2. Dignity: A system which guarantees recipients the same full freedoms, rights and respect as all American citizens.
3. Justice: A fair and open system which guarantees recipients the full protections of the Constitution.
4. Democracy: A system which guarantees recipients direct participation in the decisions under which they must live.

IMMEDIATE GOALS

Stopping the *illegal* practices of welfare departments:

- Midnight raids
- Other searches and seizures without search warrants
- Giving recipients smaller grants than the law says they should be getting
- Not giving recipients "special grants" for heavy clothing, household furnishings, etc., which the law says they should get
- Illegally cutting people off welfare
- Threatening, scaring, or intimidating recipients
- Discriminating against families with illegitimate children
- Discriminating against large families
- Racial discrimination
- Forcing recipients to "accept" other "social services" in order to keep their welfare grants
- Not informing recipients of their rights of appeal

Making friends or non-legally responsible relatives pay child support

Forcing mothers with young children to take jobs

Forcing recipients to live in segregated or substandard housing

Illegally rejecting applicants for welfare

Recognition of welfare recipient organizations as representatives of welfare recipients . . . including the rights to pass out information at welfare centers and to be with recipients at interviews and fair hearings.

Full budgets and grants based on *current* cost-of-living . . . in many states grants are based on costs-of-living during the 1950's.

Full budgets and grants for all welfare recipients . . . in many states, recipients receive only a percentage of the state's own grant standards for minimum health and decency.

Getting made *public* . . . to welfare recipients, their organizations, and anyone who want to know. . .

All the rules, regulations, and policies of welfare departments . . . in many places, although they are "public documents" such information is purposefully kept from welfare recipients and their organizations.

Fair hearings, immediately, with free lawyers, for recipients who believe they have been treated illegally or unfairly by welfare departments . . . most communities do not follow the federal regulations for fair hearings.

Direct representation of welfare recipients' organizations on all welfare policy-making and advisory boards.

Clearer and simplified welfare regulations, policies, and procedures.

OTHER PRESSING GOALS

National (Federal) grant minimums set at or above the Federal poverty line.

Ending "categories" for assistance (such as OAA, AFDC, home relief).

Having only one category for assistance—*need*.

Welfare grants for all people who have incomes below grant levels—including people who are employed.

Property maximums for welfare eligibility set at equal to one year's income at the Federal poverty line.

Getting rid of "man in the house" and "suitable home" regulations and laws, except as they apply to the *whole* public.

Court-ordered child support payments for welfare children paid directly to welfare departments, with welfare families getting full, regular grants.

Application for welfare by affidavit (sworn statement that the person applying is eligible) with *immediate* grants unless or until the person is proved ineligible.

An end to all residency requirements.

Enough money for food, rather than food stamps.

More Federal money for welfare.

Minimum standards for clothing and household furnishings.

Clerical and sub-professional jobs in welfare departments for recipients who are able to and wish to work.

Federal money for "home relief" programs.

Getting rid of "special investigation units" in welfare departments.

Ending "relative responsibility" except for parent-for-child.

Allowing all recipients to earn some money without deducting it from their welfare grants.

Ending all liens by welfare departments on welfare recipients' property.

Making all banks cash welfare checks.

Providing child care for welfare mothers who are able to and wish to work.

Providing real job training and actual jobs for recipients who are able to and wish to work.

Emergency public assistance . . . available 24 hours a day.

Dividing public welfare into two completely separate parts:

- (1) One agency handling only welfare grants (income assistance . . . a clerical rather than social-work agency).
- (2) Another handling all other social services . . . a social work agency handling counseling, guidance, training, etc.

[From Now! national welfare leaders newsletter, vol. 1, No. 11]

CONGRESS READIES ANTI-WELFARE LAWS—DEMONSTRATION CALLED FOR NATION'S CAPITOL AUGUST 28

WELFARE RIGHTS NEWS

Cleveland welfare rights movement wins furniture

The basic needs campaign in Cleveland has succeeded in getting the Welfare Department to tell workers to meet all basic needs requests for beds, mattresses-blankets, tables, and chairs, stoves, refrigerators and washing machines.

The Welfare Department also admitted that they had not been "uniform" in meeting requests for these basic needs. The fight to prevent the closing of the Hough office (in the ghetto) continues.

We've got rights!

An excellent summary of the growing legal attack on the welfare system is to be found in Richard A. Cloward's and Frances Fox Piven's latest article in the *New Republic's* August 5, 1967 issue. Reprints are available from the Poverty/Rights Action Center for 25¢—all four Cloward/Piven articles for \$1.00

Four locals now in Utica

The Utica (New York) Welfare Rights Movement now has 4 chapters. Mrs. Annie Mae Goodson is Coordinating Chairman. Mrs. Goodson, Mrs. Beatrice English, James Hooks, and Diana Compolongo head the locals.

Iowa welfare rights now has two active groups. Mrs. Margaret Rees is chairman of the Mothers for Adequate Welfare in Waterloo, and Mrs. Margaret Beechum is chairman of the Progressive Action Club in Muscatine.

GOALS FOR THE NATIONAL WELFARE RIGHTS MOVEMENT

Enclosed in this issue is the statement of goals for the National Welfare Rights Movement, developed at a workshop at the August 1966 national meeting in Chicago.

It will serve as a basic working document for the convention. What changes are needed?

ACTION

Congress must know that if this bill passes it will directly contribute to the crisis in our cities. We must make our voices heard on this anti-welfare bill.

1. Plan to send a bus from your community to join the national demonstration Monday, August 28, in Washington, D.C. against this bill and for jobs and decent income now. (See next page for details.)

2. Write your Congressman today to protest this anti-welfare, anti-poor people bill ("1967 Social Security amendments").

3. Contact church, social worker, civil rights and other liberal groups and especially all grassroots community groups and get them to protest this bill; write their Congressmen, and to join your delegation to Washington, D.C., on August 28.

Now!

The national welfare rights movement invites ghetto and barrio groups from across the country to join in opposing oppressive anti-welfare legislation and to demand jobs and decent income now!

In a Washington, D.C., demonstration, Monday, August 28.

Liberal, labor, church, social work and civil rights groups are also urged to attend.

Groups should plan to arrive in Washington by 10 a.m. and to stay through 5 p.m.

Lobbying visits to Congressmen will be

scheduled in the morning as well as meetings with OEO, Labor, HEW, HUD, and other officials. The demonstration and rally will be held in the afternoon.

For additional information contact: Poverty/Rights Action Center, 1713 R Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

More money now!

NATIONAL CONVENTION AUGUST 25 TO 28

These dates are definite—disregard earlier dates:

The First National Welfare Rights Movement Convention will be held in Washington, D.C., August 25 to 28.

See Newsletter #15 for the Convention Call and full details.

Each welfare rights group has received a pre-registration form for its delegates.

Delegates will be based on paid up members. Both the money and the national record cards for members must be turned in to count toward delegates. Groups should have their membership money and national record cards in to national headquarters as soon as possible. Membership money and national record cards will be accepted at the convention but this may delay seating of some of those delegates.

Delegates will be sent details of registration, maps showing the convention location, and information on how and where to register in Washington. Groups should return the yellow pre-registration form with the names of their delegates as soon as possible.

Any welfare recipients or organizers who wish to attend the convention as observers should notify national headquarters immediately as space will be limited.

All group members and supporters are urged to plan to come to Washington on Monday, August 28, for the national demonstration on jobs and decent income.

Call national headquarters today if you have questions!

CONGRESS READIES ANTI-WELFARE LAWS

The House Ways and Means Committee this week announced its proposals on welfare. They proposed that:

All states be required to set up Work and Training Programs for welfare recipients.

Every welfare recipient over 16 years of age who is determined able be required to participate in work or training or be cut off welfare. This would include mothers.

Instead of providing more money for children in their own homes, more money would be provided for children placed in foster homes, states establish more programs for investigating "neglect and abuse of children" with more "child welfare works" to remove children from their own homes.

States not receive federal money for more children than are presently on the rolls—welfare rolls would be frozen at present levels.

The Committee did not include the Administration proposal that all states be required to meet 100% of their own standard of need. It also did not require states to aid families with dependent children when a parent is unemployed (AFDC-UP).

These proposals are a direct attack on poor people. This bill would continue to use welfare as a weapon to divide families and now try to force mothers to work whether or not this is in the best interest of their children.

Instead of providing for real jobs it proposes more WET training—which a majority of the time does not lead to jobs. And now it seems that once "trained", people will be cut off welfare—whether or not they are able to find work.

WELFARE RIGHTS NEWS

Pittsfield, Mass., PAPA marches

Mrs. Barbara Bragdon, President of PAPA (Pittsfield Association of Parents for Adequate Welfare) reports that her group is continuing to press for fair hearings even though some people have been denied hearings.

The PAPA protest on June 30 was described as the "most militant act ever staged by Pittsfield welfare recipients." PAPA got friendly support from the Mayor but there has been little action on their 16 demands for changes in welfare department procedures.

Mrs. Bragdon, mother of 7, will lead the PAPA delegation to the national convention.

Lancaster, Pa.

The Citizens Welfare Group led by Mrs. Charlotte Stewart, Chairman, picketing the County Board of Public Assistance on June 30, got the County Welfare Director to admit publicly "we aren't paying the minimum standards of health and decency. The state doesn't have the money."

Louisville welfare organization elects officers

The Louisville Welfare Organization has elected Mrs. Mae Belle Potter, President. Mrs. Potter, 30, mother of 6 children, says she joined the welfare rights movement "to get the benefits we are entitled to." Her first act as president was to telephone the Kentucky State Welfare Director to press for changes in state policy as demanded by Kentucky Welfare Rights groups on June 30.

The group plans a dance August 15 to raise money to send their delegates to the convention.

Wiley to speak at national Catholic conference

George Wiley will speak on "The Equal Rights of the Poor" at the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice in Kansas City, Aug. 17-20.

EXHIBIT D

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. HULETT SMITH,
Governor of West Virginia,
Charleston, W. Va.

DEAR GOVERNOR SMITH: As you know, OEO, at your request and in cooperation with your offices, has been conducting an investigation of the following charges cited in your letter of August 14, 1967, to Sargent Shriver:

1. Babcock State Park disturbance.
 2. Alleged immoral conduct in Wyoming County
 3. Misuse of GSA vehicles
 4. Nicholas County controversy
 5. Effects of sedition arrests in Kentucky
- Briefly, our investigation found the following:

1. The Volunteers at Babcock State Park, while not nearly as inconsiderate as first noted, did indeed disturb neighboring cabins on the night of July 22.

The charges of tampering with vehicles and of destroying park property were found to be invalid. However, there seems to be no question the Volunteers who stayed at the park did disturb some people using the park. We feel the Babcock State Park incident might have been avoided with better planning and supervision on the part of the Appalachian Volunteers and with better notification of State Park officials of the exact nature and duration of the conference held there. The fact is that apparently no planning concerning the possibility of rain took place and Volunteers had to make their own arrangements in the midst of the sudden downpour. By copy of this letter, we are relating our concern to Mr. Milton Ogle, Director of the Appalachian Volunteers.

We regret that this incident took place and will work closely with the Appalachian Volunteers and your office to insure that similar incidents do not reoccur in the future.

2. We found no verification for the charges of immoral conduct by VISTAs or Appalachian Volunteers in Wyoming County or any of the other counties in which VISTA and the Appalachian Volunteers worked in West

Virginia. You should know, however, that there are rumors of immorality in Wyoming County and that, while untrue, may continue to disturb the program of the Appalachian Volunteers. This means that the Appalachian Volunteers should make even greater efforts to maintain high standards of conduct in the communities where they are working. A total of 21 people were interviewed in Wyoming County and were unable to provide any concrete evidence for the charges. We feel that increased supervision this summer by Appalachian Volunteer staff has led to more satisfactory behavior by the Volunteers.

3. The charge of misuse of a government vehicle by a VISTA Volunteer was found to be true. A VISTA Volunteer drove the vehicle with a friend to Charleston, West Virginia, for social purposes.

Since this is an inappropriate use of a government vehicle, we have transferred the car from her use and will not make a GSA vehicle available to her in the future. Any Volunteer found to be misusing a government vehicle will have GSA vehicles removed from his use as a minimal action taken by VISTA in the future.

4. The charges of Appalachian Volunteer Summer Associates in Nicholas County calling for the "mass dismissal of a number of the county's elected officials and school personnel" were unfounded. We feel that the Appalachian Volunteer-VISTA group conducted itself well within the bounds required by OEO. The OEO investigation did find that a number of citizens of this county have opposed the policies of the school principal in question for several years, thus predating both CAP and VISTA programs. Because of their interest in tutoring and other education-related matters, VISTA Volunteers did work with people who had doubts about school policy.

5. As you know, a panel of three Federal Judges has recently ruled unconstitutional the sedition law under which an Appalachian Volunteer fieldman was indicted.

Because of the current misunderstanding about the Appalachian Volunteers and the need for closer coordination and administrative tightening, we are increasing our staff in West Virginia. A new staff member, Miss Denise Cavanaugh, will work full time in the state and an additional staff person will be added to work part time in coordinating with the Appalachian Volunteers in West Virginia. Mr. Richard Dodds will continue to have overall responsibility for the state and will continue to work closely with the State OEO Technical Assistance Director, Mr. Jeff Monroe, and his staff.

While the Appalachian Volunteers were found to have violated no major or minor OEO regulations, they can be criticized for incomplete planning. Therefore, we do think it essential that the Appalachian Volunteers show an increased awareness of the need to communicate to the general public the nature of the program, especially since the general public has heard principally the charges and none of the positive aspects of the group's efforts, and of the need to take appropriate steps to insure that the incidents which did occur will not happen again. For example, I think the need for an intensive Volunteer orientation to the area (and this holds true for Volunteers across the country) has been underscored during the events of the past several weeks and we will require that such an orientation is a part of the training for every Volunteer who serves in West Virginia. We are grateful for your offer to provide staff to participate in this aspect of the training and we intend to take immediate advantage of it. For example, this week members of the West Virginia Department of Mental Health are in Kansas training and selecting VISTA Volunteers who will serve in the highly successful West Virginia Mental Health project.

To further implement the training sugges-

tion and others, I have directed our mid-Atlantic Regional Administrator to work with Mr. Monroe and the Appalachian Volunteer staff to set up regular, periodic meetings to review program progress and potential problem areas.

VISTA has held the Appalachian Volunteer program in high regard and will make every effort to insure that the program is maintained at a professional level. We are glad that you have not let a few incidents influence your judgment about the program, and we are grateful for your support, both now and in the past, for overall VISTA efforts in West Virginia.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. CROOK,
Director, VISTA.

INTERIM RESULTS OF THE OEO INVESTIGATION INTO COMPLAINTS MADE AGAINST APPALACHIAN VOLUNTEERS AND VISTA VOLUNTEERS IN WEST VIRGINIA

This is an interim statement containing the results of the OEO investigation into a series of complaints made against the VISTA and Appalachian Volunteers (AVs) program over the past summer. A complete investigation on all significant complaints is in the process of being completed. This statement contains the present status of the investigation with respect to four of the complaints contained in the letter from Governor Hulett Smith of August 14 to the Director of OEO. Charges and details (The charges are quoted from the governor's letter.)

1. Charge: "A group of persons identified as AVs and VISTA personnel staged a riotous all night party on July 22 at Babcock State Park—destroying park property, interfering with the exit and entrance of other park guests, tampering with automobiles and generally disturbing the peace. Several of these persons used Federal government automobiles, raising the possible question of misuse of U.S. Government property (as well as being abominable public relations for the national administration)."

Details: On Saturday, July 22, an AV training program involving 89 people in an overnight camp-out at Babcock State Park was rained out at about 11:00 p.m. The majority of the campers, none of whom had tents, left the park and returned to their communities. About a dozen stayed in the park at one of two park cabins rented for the night by an AFL-CIO training officer. Five others stayed at the second cabin. The cabin where the twelve stayed was located some 40 yards from two occupied cabins. The people in these cabins complained to the Park Superintendent that a wild party was held late into the night. The AV's in the cabin contend that there was much loud discussion, but not a real party.

The purpose of the AV gathering was to hold a mid-summer conference-training-discussion session. This was done with the approval of VISTA. This removes the question of misuse of the GSA cars.

There was little preparation for the event. An AV staffer, went to the park and got general information about a week before, but gave the park no notice of the AV plans. Despite this, the arrival of the almost 90 members of the AV session were assimilated into the camp with a minimum disturbance and the group finally settled in the evening in an overflow camp site across the highway and behind a clump of trees from other campers. The park superintendent says when he made his 10:00 P.M. rounds everything was all right. Then it rained.

The disturbance could not be called riotous although noisy and probably inconsiderate; there was no property damage attributed to the AVs by the park superintendent. One park guest told the superintendent that his distributor wire was cut during the night but the superintendent said he had no basis but guess work to tie this to the AVs—the man's cabin was at a location away from the AV

disturbances. The other charges in the letter about tampering with cars were, according to the superintendent, instances where people heard a group near their car and were afraid something might be done to it.

One of the people staying in the two neighboring cabins says she spent a sleepless night and thought the AVs must have had an "unsupervised ball" until about 3:30 A.M. She says there was loud singing with guitars and banging of doors. She thinks there was a lot of drinking, but says she saw no bottles. She says her husband did not ask them to be quiet because they were afraid they might be attacked—this was also the reason they didn't try to go for help in their car. Although the two ends of the loop drive past their cabin were sometimes blocked with about four different cars, she remembers they were not blocked during all of the party.

The family had planned to leave the next morning for home, but delayed their trip until the following day so they could get a good night's rest.

The lady says, "We can go anywhere and get this kind of behavior—we went to the park to get away from it." She adds that the AVs were crummy-looking—she noted particularly that one girl had sores on her legs which she attributed to being dirty. She says that some were all right and that she didn't see them until the morning after the incident when they had been caught in the rain.

One camper left the park in the afternoon because of the AVs who had first attempted to fit into four six-man camp sites (24 total) in the main camping area. His reasons as given by the park superintendent were that his site was a path-way between areas rented by the AVs. One AV staffer says he told them that he objected to their beer drinking. The AV's say they were told by park officials that they could drink the beer. The provisions for the group brought three cases of beer and three cases of soft drink. They were told to move to the over-flow area because of their numbers. They agreed to do so with approval of an unidentified park ranger after dinner so they could use the stoves on the camp sites—none were available on the over-flow site. The superintendent was not asked directly if he gave permission for beer drinking but he knew of the beer drinking in the afternoon and made no effort to restrict it.

With respect to the other charges in the letter from Superintendent, he says cabin guest did not actually have his car tampered with, but said the AVs were "messing around" and was apparently afraid they might tamper with it. Another report from a person described in the letter, "a lodge guest" was from a temporary park employee who was afraid the noise outside might endanger his state truck; this man, however, did not notify the superintendent.

It seems likely that much of the disturbances reported by other guests was a result of AV campers and possibly other campers looking for a place out of the rain—the lodge would be a logical place to look as well as the two cabins rented by the AFL-CIO Training Officer, one of which is in the far corner of the park and probably was not found. This explanation was considered possible by the park superintendent.

2. Charge: "Reports from Wyoming County, West Virginia, indicate confidence in, and effectiveness of, the VISTA-AV program has been seriously weakened by immoral conduct on the part of several of these volunteers. While these persons logically argue that their personal lives are their own affair, the fact remains that promiscuity, particularly when it crosses racial lines, is not accepted by the community as a whole and damages public respect and support for the VISTA and AV program."

The key source on AV immorality in Wyoming County, a neighbor of the former office-apartment of the AVs on Broadway Street in Mullens did not articulate much de-

tail about the AV misconduct. He said that he saw some kissing. The only example of this was an incident outside the AV office when he said some guy lined up a whole lot of girls and went down the line kissing them. The often repeated complaint is that a group of boys and girls stayed overnight on occasion sleeping on the floor in sleeping bags. This source says, "They were staying in there together, but I couldn't say if they stayed overnight. I would see them in the morning."

One VISTA who lives in the apartment says that on two occasions groups stayed overnight. The first time was after a big cookout organized at Herndon Heights. About 15 AVs stayed overnight on the floor in sleeping bags of the office rather than drive home later at night. The next time four stayed after getting to Mullens late from Beckley July 23 where they attended a local pageant called "Honey in the Rock." These groups included boys and girls, but no Negroes were included.

A boyfriend of one VISTA girl stayed overnight about twice, but the VISTA Volunteer slept in the bedroom with her roommate and the boyfriend slept in the next room.

She moved out of the apartment on Broadway after she learned that she was in physical danger; the storefront windows on the building were broken by vandals. She moved temporarily to Brenton where two AV girls have a trailer.

The two remaining neighbors of the AV apartment which is the subject of complaint were contacted. One said that his only objection was "just the looks of the outfit—as dirty looking as a damn sewer. I haven't seen anything take place. I could hear them some but they didn't bother me. I was afraid they'd agitate the colored. They went up to a colored restaurant in Goose Hollow to get meals sometimes. The better class of white people didn't mess with them."

A second neighbor says he thought nothing of the AVs as neighbors except they were a little dirty. He said he would be sound asleep by 11:00 p.m. every night.

One of the VISTAs lived in another apartment before moving to the Broadway address. She left before she was asked to leave, but her landlord said he had complaints from neighbors that she was noisy late at night. He would have asked her to leave if she had not done so. A local official who looked into the matter said he found that the VISTA had been loud on occasion (she admits playing her phonograph at night) and at one point had a loud party. The official says such parties happen often in most neighborhoods—he said it was basically innocent, the kind of party he would have enjoyed. The former landlord, however, complains that the VISTA also damaged some property such as removing doors from bookcases, a kitchenette broke down and some chairs were damaged. The landlord also complained that he had to repaint the apartment. He says he observed none of her behavior while the VISTA was his tenant and got no complaints except about noise.

A total of 21 residents of Wyoming County were interviewed concerning AV activities; none had more specific information about immorality than covered above.

3. Charge: "On August 6, pickets protesting U.S. participation in the Viet Nam war staged a demonstration on the lawn of the State Capitol. The protest, which was peaceful and orderly, included five VISTA-AV workers from Raleigh County. While I affirm their right to their own views on the Vietnamese situation, the fact that they drove to Charleston in a clearly marked U.S. Government car, which was parked near the Capitol, attracted considerable attention, as the attached State Police report reveals. The use of a Federally-owned car for such purposes certainly is open to question."

Details: A VISTA working with the AVs admitted that she and a summer AV drove

to Charleston from Beckley in a GSA car to do some sightseeing. The two workers stopped at the State Capitol and participated in an anti-Viet Nam war rally they found in progress. Later, they accompanied a demonstration leader to his home. After their visit, they went back to Beckley.

The AVs learned of this after Governor Smith's letter became public. They confirmed the incident and suspended the workers from further use of cars for a short period. VISTA has directed the AVs to make the suspension permanent. Short-term suspension was also imposed last winter when the AV staff learned that volunteers assigned to them had taken two GSA cars from Beckley to Bluefield to attend a movie. The summer AV involved left the AVs with the end of the summer program.

The GSA car was one assigned to a volunteer attached to the Beckley County CAA and borrowed for official purposes according to the AV staff.

Attempts to reach the State Department of Public Safety for information concerning the allegation that there were five VISTA-AV workers present from Raleigh County, rather than the two so far identified, have not been completed and will be checked out.

4. Charge: "A respected State Senator, Carl E. Gainer, from central West Virginia has protested formally the activities of VISTA and AV workers in Nicholas County. These persons apparently have called for the mass dismissal of a number of the county's elected officials and school personnel. While such social protest might be valid, the absence of constructive alternatives to the problems of the community has led to a general feeling that the VISTA-AV group is composed of 'trouble-makers' who offer only negative solutions to community problems. Charges of teaching 'ideas that are Communistic' have been made."

Details: Most of the controversy in Nicholas County has centered on the CAA education committee efforts to make changes in a Summersville High School. These efforts have included reports calling for the removal of the county school superintendent, the school board and the high school principal unless reforms are made. There have been no general or specific requests for resignations of other public officials. The AVs who worked in the county over the summer under the general direction of the local CAA director have not promoted the school issue, but have attempted to help get people out to meetings where these issues are being discussed. There was no evidence to support the charges of communism against the AVs contained in the letter to Governor Smith. Using leads supplied by the Principal complainant, no one was found in Richwood or Summersville with first-hand knowledge of what the VISTA workers have been doing in the areas where they have worked—none indicated knowledge of VISTAs teaching communism.

EXHIBIT E

SHERIFF AND TREASURER,
RALEIGH COUNTY,
Beckley, W. Va., September 21, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: Attached you will find copy of a small publication which is being put out by some area citizens aided by VISTA workers and the Area Youth Corp.

Bob, the investigators sent into our area are doing and have done one of the best jobs of white-washing that I have ever witnessed. These so-called investigators came into this County after having made up their minds regarding the situation and refused to listen or look into any problems, they simply made as few calls as possible and then came away saying exactly the same things in exactly the same language they had used when they first arrived.

Preconceived ideas and indoctrination of the persons who have been sent in to evaluate the poverty programs have made it impossible to obtain anything but a biased report. Again, Bob, I would like to ask you and our other representatives for some help down here before it is too late.

Very sincerely yours,

OKEY A. MILLS,

Sheriff.

P.S. Bob, I still feel that part of the program is good. The administration of this program could have been planned by Civil Rights Leadership. I still hope we can have constructive changes in our Federal setup. It may be too late already. Bob, send some investigators from your Democratic Caucus to look into this Federal Stupidity.

Sincerely,

OKEY.

SHERIFF AND TREASURER,
RALEIGH COUNTY,

Beckley, W. Va., February 17, 1967.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JENNINGS: We are asking your help in trying to solve a problem caused by one of our Democratic Programs that has reached the place where it is to the point of being fantastic. I make direct reference to the VISTA Program under the C.A.A.

I will not bother you with numerous details but it is hard for me to believe this program, as it is being administered, is a result of the thinking of any sane department of our U.S. Government. It would seem that it was dreamed up in a mental institution.

This program is making the Democratic Party in our County look ridiculous to the point of absurdity. It is beyond my imagination to think that the results of this program could be due to the direct action of any sub-divisions of our government and the blame thereto laid directly to the Democratic Party. There is one person that I know of that would be pleased with this program and that is Gus Hall.

I would be most pleased if we could get someone to come to Raleigh County and investigate the actions of these people. I would also appreciate someone investigating the feelings of local people as a direct result of this program. We have many Federal Programs under the Democrats which are worth while and should be progressing as far as the Government is concerned and the Democratic Party is concerned. We are sitting on our rear ends and letting two or three parts of the program not only tear down all of the good that the rest of the program is doing but is disgusting our Democratic wage earning citizens to the point that they have resentment toward the Federal Government that is reaching the point of no return. I am making direct reference to people who have been good Democrats all their life and have worked for a living and do not owe anyone a dime and have voted Democratic because they wanted to.

I, personally, am a strong Democrat and intend to remain a loyal Democrat but I am disgusted with this program and if something is not done by the leaders of our party, I fully intend to make a personal call to Drew Pearson and ask him to come down and check into this program. I hope that this is not necessary but if some action is not taken by our leaders, I will not be deterred in my intention to follow through. If you think that the only trouble in this program is in Raleigh County, I would suggest that you check with the other counties that have this program.

In conclusion, let me say, please pay attention to this letter.

Very sincerely yours,

OKEY A. MILLS,

Sheriff.

BRADLEY, W. Va.,
January 10, 1967.

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: We have discussed the expenditure of funds for Community Action Programs and especially those paid to Vista workers.

Admittedly Vista workers can do good work in certain areas of the world if educated and trained but I do not believe an 18 or 19 year old can come into Raleigh County without training, looking in most cases more in need of assistance than our own people, and accomplish much in the way of a "better life" for those in the rural areas.

I am enclosing two clippings from our local paper which I feel may be of interest to you. I certainly do not know of any training program in Raleigh County which would produce qualified workers for the Vista program.

No doubt this lack of training is considered to be an asset to a Vista worker as Radio advertising for Vista Workers specifies "No Training" required.

I trust something will be done about this reckless spending of our tax money.

Sincerely,

J. A. BLACKBURN.

THE SENATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
August 8, 1967.

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I am enclosing a news release which appeared in the Sunday Gazette August 6, 1967 and a letter from one of my constituents dated August 5, 1967 which I sincerely believe at this time is the genuine concern of most of the citizens of Nicholas County.

It is rather unusual that any group would be wanting to ask the resignation of the School Superintendent, Principal of Summersville High School, the Sheriff and the County Road Supervisor all in the same meeting. It is also unusual that Senator Paul Kaufman and Ralph Murphine would be present for the Friday night meeting along with the Vista Workers and *Appalachia Volunteers*. As far as I can tell there was no announcement made to the general public of this meeting and only these people selected by the Vistas and Volunteers were transported to the meeting in their own cars.

I have watched the Vista Workers from the beginning of the program and I believe that I made the statement to Senator Randolph and Governor Smith at lunch at my home last August before the Cherry River Navy parade that if they were allowed to continue they would defeat the Democratic Party in the 1968 election.

It has certainly become more evident in my district with the increase of these workers coming in the county. No doubt, a very small percentage of these workers are sincere and do a good job but by and large the majority are a bunch of improperly misguided misfits who are I believe endangering our concept of law and order in this nation. I do not think these workers were ever needed in this County and would respectfully ask for their resignation.

Very truly yours,

CARL E. GAINER,
State Senate.

Senator ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In the Allen-Scott Report in *Daily Mail* (Charleston, W. Va.) on July 31, 1967, report was made of charges by Rep. James Gardner (R-NC) implicating government financed anti-poverty workers in inciting riots and directly involved in agitations.

Under ordinary conditions, I would not get too excited about this item, for it did not directly concern our community, but after some unpleasant publicity regarding anti-poverty workers (Better Community Action-OEO) in this county, I feel a protest is in order.

Here in this county, we have good stable citizens who are interested in progress, education and all the better things for our families . . . and until now, we have had no smirching of our schools with dope raids, long-haired, rude and untidy students, moral problems and the like. This has been due to the fine Administrators employed by the Board of Education. However, at the moment, meetings are held by the Community Action Groups with guest speakers from surrounding counties promoting changes and shouting unfair school policies and charging public institutions with "lining their mink-lined pockets".

I am a high school teacher and a mother of two teen-agers. I resent the implications that our school people are doing so many things wrong, for I know that is not true. Personally, I like strict rules in the schools for that makes for much better schools and better future citizens. At this very moment the Community Action seek the resignation of our fine Principal and Assistant. Only last week they demanded the resignation of our Superintendent of Schools.

These Administrators are fine, intelligent, and dedicated men who could further their financial status by going to other states, but have not done so. We are most fortunate to have matters in the schools handled so efficiently and there is not need for anti-poverty to advise these experienced and well trained educators.

I deeply resent that my hard earned teacher dollars help to pay these inexperienced, untrained, and hysterical workers. Instead of Better Community they very well might force this community to a much worse one.

You will find enclosed some newspaper clippings which will further explain this matter and will somehow convince you that I am not a hysterical constituent whose sole purpose is to complain and make trouble. These Better Community Workers are a detriment to our school. Can someone do something to help us retain our previous status without OEO interference?

Very truly yours,

Librarian.

WILLIAMSON PIGGLY WIGGLY, INC.,
Williamson, W. Va., August 2, 1967.
U.S. Senator ROBERT BYRD,
House of Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are a Kentucky firm located in Pike County, Kentucky, bordering a West Virginia county, Mingo, and enjoy a reasonable amount of business from West Virginia.

On Monday, July 31, 1967, a group of VISTA workers entered our store. They arrived at our store in a government car driven by a female. This group was composed of two colored girls and three colored boys. We do not know if they all were VISTA workers. These workers have headquarters in your state in Mingo County.

While the girls shopped as normal one of the boys wandering through different departments of the store entered our produce department. He had a marks-a-lot pencil, which is a pencil used for marking merchandise. He marked 5¢ on a lemon. An employee of ours, Benjamin Beverly, advised him that our Manager would not approve of this. He said "I'm not afraid of your manager or anyone else in the store." Beverly said "I am not the only boy in the store, we have more in the back room." The colored boy walked away from the produce department toward the meat department and our Meat Manager, David Crigger,

heard him say "Do you think one of them could shoot this gun I have in my pocket." He then asked Mr. Crigger if he had any Hard Coconuts. Mr. Crigger advised him that he would have to ask our produce clerk. The boy then said "He is just like you, he doesn't know anything either." Mr. Crigger did not reply and the boy walked away.

Several of our customers noticed his rudeness and saw him re-enter the government car with the others. A government car being a carrier of this type of ill will could be projected in the minds of on lookers as an ally of this type of doings.

We do not wish to magnify this incident and we know it is small in comparison with the racial disturbances elsewhere, but if this is an example of the attitudes and actions of any government group it could very well cause some bad situations.

We do not discriminate in our employment and now have, as we have had in the past, colored employees.

We again emphasize that we do not want to ignite a fuse, only hope that this bit of information will help to serve as one of the many corrective measures that are so badly needed in this racial strife.

Yours truly,

WILLIAMSON PIGGLY WIGGLY, INC.
CLAUDE P. VARNEY, Manager.

AUGUST 10, 1967.

HON. ROBERT BYRD,
Washington, D.C.:

We have some V. Vista workers here in Wyo. Co. who is working against the Democrat party and causing a lot of disturbances among people, one here, 20 yr. old from rich family in Chicago. I hear all that is going on in Post Office, let me know what this is all about. They are telling the people here that they aren't getting what is due them. Get a big stir up about the water works and giving the ring in Wyo. Co. thunder. Thanks for an answer or get these people out of here.

Yours truly,

POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Huntington, W. Va., July 31, 1967.

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: For the past several weeks, the City of Huntington has been fraught with rumors of racial strife; i.e., riots, looting, burning, etc. On every occasion we have attempted to get to the source of the rumors and found each of them to be untrue. However, we have found that each time these rumors started one or more of the following people were in the City: Phillip Carter Negro/Male, Pat Austin Negro/Female, Ann Adams White/Female, and Marion Hanley White/Female. From past experience we know these people are trouble makers. Our information now is that each are active in the furtherance of the Black Power Movement. They were each in the City of Huntington over this past weekend attempting to set up Black Power Movement meetings.

Our information is that Carter, Austin, Adams, and possibly Marion Hanley are employees of the Federal Government. Phillip Carter is reported to be employed by OEO in some capacity in Norman, Oklahoma. The three females are reported to be employed by OEO in some capacity in New York City. Carter was formerly assigned to the Job Corps at Lake Vesuvius in Ironton, Ohio; Pat Austin and Ann Adams were employed in some capacity with the Job Corps in the City of Huntington and Marion Hanley was employed by Action in the City of Huntington.

We have the best of relations with the local F.B.I. agents; however, we sometimes feel that information we pass on to them and which they forward to Washington may be filtering back to these same people. We

have no basis of fact for this except our intuition.

It would be greatly appreciated if you could possibly cause a confidential check made of these people through your office to determine if they are employees of the Federal Government. It is felt that the appointment of the Blue Ribbon Commission by the President to investigate riots will be of no value if the Federal Government in fact is financing, at least in an indirect manner, people of this caliber who are advocating revolution in this country.

Your assistance in this matter will be greatly appreciated and any other information we might be able to furnish you on Carter, Austin, Adams, and Hanley, we would be glad to do so.

Sincerely,

G. H. KLEINKNECHT,
Chief of Police.

LAW OFFICES SAYRE & SAYRE,
Beckley, W. Va., May 5, 1967.

Senator ROBERT C. BYRD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: The great "Vista Workers" of the Johnson-Kennedy-Shriver regime made a vicious attack on Presidents Hoover and Eisenhower at their Jacksons Mill training program this week, according to the newspapers, and the Rev. Jack S. Stephenson of Cincinnati, director of the training camp, said the trainees were giving vent to their expression. This damnable practice and procedure should stop and our senators and congressmen should see that it stops. The taxpayers of this country are paying the bill and we have a right to expect better treatment.

This entire program is a farce from beginning to end. Some of these so-called volunteers came into Raleigh County and proceeded to stir up all the trouble they could. We have some surface mining going on in our county and last summer we had a disastrous and unprecedented flood and it caused some damage, and they proceeded to go abroad, hauling people to the site, trying to make a mountain out of a molehill, while the company was doing everything possible to rectify the damages done. They even went to the legislature and made all kinds of untrue statements, and you might say stampeded the Legislature of West Virginia into passing an unworkable surface mining law, and reported that our company had not done anything to alleviate the damage, and I quote with respect to one case from a letter written by an official of the company to a local lawyer in Beckley under date of January 9, 1967, concerning the claim being made by one, Ernest Bonds, concerning a very small parcel of land, and I quote from the letter without mentioning the name of the attorney:

"Sufficient information now has been furnished by our engineers for reply to your letter of December 9, 1966, regarding claims in the vicinity of our mining operations at Drews Creek.

"We must take exception to your statement that in connection with these claims 'to date nothing has been done.' Prior to the date of your letter, property affected by our operations was landscaped by skilled people in a fashion which not only removed all debris, but also provided drainage superior to that which existed prior to our arrival. With respect to landscaping already accomplished, we have agreed to seed the same area at the appropriate time and that agreement will be kept.

"In accomplishing the foregoing, the following expenditures, in addition to our engineers' time, have been made:

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| "30 hours D-8 bulldozer rental at \$20 | \$600.00 |
| 8 hours grader rental at \$15 | 120.00 |
| 24 hours truck rental at \$10 | 240.00 |
| Labor | 202.84 |
| Total | 1,162.84 |

"Concerning the dwelling which allegedly was damaged by our blasting, our engineers carefully inspected this dwelling and found that the only condition of damage existing is the result of normal depreciation but in no way attributable to our operations.

"It always has been the policy of our companies to meet any responsibility to the public resulting from our operations and we believe you will find from personal inspection that we have more than done so in this instance."

This reputable attorney refused to prosecute their alleged vicious and unfounded claim.

The above states more completely the efforts made by the company I represent as an attorney than I am able to give you concerning the various claims made. The amount of work done to alleviate the damage amounted to more than the value of the land. This is just one instance of their trouble making.

During the last year or so there have been a lot of stories making the rounds concerning the actions and conduct of these people. One man was chosen by the Governor as Director of the Economic Opportunity Program for Raleigh County and he was not vicious enough and the Vista workers had him fired.

A grandson of a very well known Raleigh County citizen, now deceased, former state senator and well known lawyer throughout this section of West Virginia, was a dropout and in some manner got him a job and came into Raleigh County as a Vista worker. He traveled with others of lesser standing. He was dirty, clothes unclean and unkempt, rooming in a home of a colored family in East Park, and I understand that they wouldn't keep him because he would go to bed with his shoes on. He never called on his grandmother, so I understand, although he was rooming within 1/2 mile of her home, and she did not know he was in the county. His grandmother is a very refined lady and not very well, and I expect she would have passed out if she had seen him or had received knowledge of what was going on.

This is just a sample of some of the Vista workers we have had in our county, and some of their actions and conduct would not stand the light of investigation. I don't know of any good they have done. They just cause trouble and raise the hell.

In order to save time I am sending a copy of this letter to Congressman Slack and a copy to Congressman Arch A. Moore.

With kindest personal regards to all three of you, I am

Sincerely yours,

FLOYD M. SAYRE.

HANOVER, W. VA.,
August 15, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We have in our neighborhood four young people who say they have been sent here by the Federal Government to help Poverty Stricken people of W. Va.

They call themselves Appalachian Volunteers of America. They seem to be arousing suspicion among some people, whether they are really working for the betterment of the people in Wyoming County, W. Va., or are they going about ensnaring riots, are maybe Sedition. Will you please let me hear from you with literature concerning these people, as I'm very interested in helping the poverty programs. I've been working with these people and have seen nothing wrong, but the people won't help us if we don't furnish proof that they are sent out by the Federal Government as they say.

As I have written you before concerning floods in Huff Creek District, and you have always given my letters your immediate at-

tention I'm hoping you will do the same with this one. Dredging Huff Creek, building bridges and better schools is what we hope these people are working for.

Please give this your attention quickly as possible so I can show the people of Huff Creek what to expect of these people.

Very truly yours,

W. W. C.

GLEN DANIEL, W. VA.,
January 12, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Would it be possible for you senators to send a committee to Raleigh County to investigate the programs and methods being sponsored by the VISTA workers? I believe if congressmen can see, first-hand, the class division, the strife, and malice that is being generated right here in Raleigh County, you will want to stop it now.

When the VISTAS speak of the "people", they mean only those on relief and welfare checks. The rest of us aren't "people", we are only taxpayers.

We Raleigh County people aren't so unable to solve our own problems that "volunteers" from all over the United States have to come here and do it for us. The biggest barrier has been financial in the past. Now that funds are available, please give us a chance to work out our own problems and not send an avalanche of "young beatniks" to do it for us.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Senators Randolph, Mansfield, and Dirksen.

Please help us in this struggle for self-respect.

Sincerely yours,

V. S.

DELBARTON, W. VA.,
August 5, 1967.

DEAR SIR: I am again writing you concerning the work of the Poverty Program in Mingo County, after two special meetings of the Lee District C.A.G., called by the County organization in an attempt to oust this present group, an effort which failed, the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Mingo County E.O.C., Mr. Gerald Chafin, said they were to work with the present group, who is truly interested in trying to help the community.

Our problem is the Appalachia Volunteer's Activities. They are constantly agitating and attempting to cause trouble. They have not succeeded with but a very few people but it is enough to cause many of our people to seemingly be afraid to come out to a C.A.O. Meeting.

Tonight we had a meeting for the purpose of screening applications for work in the head start center. They came in with a man, who was highly intoxicated and kept interrupting the meeting. These volunteers are scattering hate, propaganda, plus the idea that people who work are against the poor.

It seems to us, since we have discussed this problem with various reliable people in our area that it is very much like a communist idea. Their feeling from all we can gather is overthrow regardless of what law is. Now, I ask you, Is this, what I, and others are paying taxes for?

Frankly, we think we speak for a great number in our area—GET THEM OUT and let our people work here. I am sure we can do a better job of understanding the problems of the poor than can outside agitators.

Do we get any results? or is this to be ignored also? I am very much afraid of what the results will be if they are not removed.

None of us want trouble, but if they keep agitating, I am afraid for what could happen.

Yours very truly,

C. W.

DELBARTON, W. VA.,

August 6, 1976.

DEAR SIR: I attended a Community Action Meeting August 4, 1967 of the Lee District CAG of which I am Vice Chairman. The special meeting had been called to screen applications for employment in the head start center, and selection of two (2) people to serve on an advisory group for the center.

The Appalachian Volunteers came in with a man who was highly intoxicated and kept trying to agitate trouble as were the AV's. We finally succeeded in finishing our meeting, but outside the building one of the Appalachian Volunteers, Susan School, got a group of two or three together and was threatening to take me apart. Now I ask, is this what Government money is to go for? That people life-long residents cannot get together to transact business without threats? I think it's time we re-examine closely what is going on.

Many of the people are afraid to come out to meetings for fear of trouble. There must be something done about preventing agitators from receiving Government money or we'll just let the Communist take over. I am a firm believer in free speech, but peaceable. These people seemingly are not. The only thing they seem to know is force.

Many of the people to whom I have talked feel as I do. Get the Appalachian Volunteers and Vistas out. Let our community alone. Neighbors being neighborly, not at each other's throats. They are stirring up hate in everyone.

Needless to say, I feel that the riots could well have started with agitators such as these.

Respectfully yours,

H. B.

(Mr. BYRD of West Virginia assumed the chair as Presiding Officer at this point.)

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, the hour is late and I shall be as brief as possible under the circumstances; but I should like to make a few comments on what the Senator from West Virginia has just said, and then proceed with a fairly brief argument in support of the Emergency Employment Act of 1967, which is title II of the pending bill.

Preliminarily, may I say that when the subcommittee of which I am chairman began its investigation of the poverty program in February of this year, we made a commitment that we would undertake neither a whitewash or a witch hunt. A good many months and more than 4,000 pages of testimony later, I think I can conscientiously say that we have kept that pledge.

This is not a whitewash. There are many things wrong with the poverty program. We have pointed them out in our report. We have undertaken, in this legislation, to remedy as many of them as could be remedied by tightening up legislation, and by seeking, through our oversight function, to point out to the Office of Economic Opportunity other areas where we believe administrative practices should be strengthened and improved, and, to some extent, drastically changed.

Nor was our investigation a witch hunt. We did not go out to get anybody. We did not ask a lot of loaded questions of witnesses, intended to show them up or make them look bad. We undertook to get at the truth. I believe our report does state the truth, states it objectively, states it fairly, states it clearly, and should be the basis for action by the Senate on the bill we have brought in.

The Senator from West Virginia suggests that there are many misleading statistics about the war on poverty, and complains that it is not a fair test to determine who is poor and who is not on the basis of the family incomes of the families in question.

I would reluctantly have to disagree with that point of view. I suggest that any reasonable person with the background of those of us who have been out and looked at the ghettos and met these people face to face, who have gone into their houses and seen their community facilities, who have discussed their plight not only with representatives of the OEO, but with local welfare workers, mayors, city councilmen, and various municipal and State departments, would come to the reasonable conclusion, as did a majority of the subcommittee—and I have no quarrel with the findings of other members of the subcommittee in the minority reports—that it is a pretty clearly established that there are, at the moment, somewhere in the neighborhood of between 27 million and 30 million American citizens, of all ages, races, creeds, and colors, who are living in penury by the standards set up by the OEO in the legislation to determine who is poor and who is not, by reasonable standards, standards on which we can rely.

I base this not only on the statistics which I have seen, but on the witness of my eyesight as I went around to look at these areas, all the way from the east to the west coast, down south in Mississippi, up to the Canadian border, in Chicago and elsewhere.

So I would respectfully disagree with my friend from West Virginia that the figures are distorted. In my opinion they are not, and there is now one-fifth of the Nation living ill-clothed, ill-fed, and ill-housed, just as there was, in Franklin Roosevelt's day, one-third of the Nation.

It is quite a bit of progress to go from one-third to one-fifth, and I am proud of what has been done in the intervening years. But as I say, Mr. President, there is a certain callousness in certain areas of the United States, particularly among those who have not been out to look at conditions in the urban and rural ghettos of this country. To me it is almost disgraceful that the richest Nation the world has ever known, has done as little as it has, from a sense of compassion, to bring its poor citizens up to a decent level of civilized living. I assert again—and I regret to have to disagree with the Senator from West Virginia in this regard—that those people live in penury. Many of them are hungry and their children are hungry, and there does exist in America, in various places, starvation. I would take great exception to the report the Senator from West Virginia placed in the RECORD—I did not see it, but I heard his reference to it—to the effect that in excess of 90 percent of the American people are in fact well-fed, well-clad, well-housed, and on an adequate diet. Mr. President, that in my opinion is just not true.

The Senator from West Virginia complained about the Job Corps, and Job Corps data; he said it was conflicting. He

said the record of the graduates of the Job Corps was, in many instances, defective.

I shall not undertake to answer that part of my friend's argument, because we discussed that matter this morning in connection with the debate on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska, [Mr. CURTIS] to eliminate the Job Corps. By a vote of 49 to 30, the Senate rejected the arguments made by the Senator from Nebraska and, I say in all good humor to my friend from West Virginia, the arguments which he reiterated this afternoon after the vote.

I think the statistics which have been shown as to who kept their jobs after they left the Job Corps and who got new jobs are correct statistics. I would stand by them.

My friend, as his fourth point, complained about the community action programs in many parts of the country and attacks that have been made by community action committees on the power structure and what is called "the establishment."

The Senator is correct, to some extent, in that regard. We did find, throughout the country, that there were instances where, to my way of thinking, irrational people undertook to attack the established elected officials in their particular communities. This I deplore.

On the other hand, we found, generally speaking, that these were very rare exceptions to the general rule. We also found that in a number of instances, in our opinion, the elected public officials deserved to be attacked because they were not giving a fair shake to the community action activities. And in some instances they were speaking against it.

What has happened across the country is that the poor have become articulate. Their voice, stilled by inadequate income and education, has risen to attack the conditions under which they live and under which they have been deprived for the most part of the good things in life which this country is perfectly capable of giving them.

This is a shock to many conservative people. I must say that it was a shock to me when I first saw it. I think that there have been some instances in which there has been inflammatory action.

I remember one witness in Los Angeles, whom I shall not name, whose behavior was entirely deplorable.

I remember an upstate New York city where I cannot believe that common-sense motivated the officials when they acted with such vigor and took such inflammatory action.

I say again that in my opinion these are rare exceptions and should not be translated into the rule. Moreover, generally speaking, the community action program have done vastly more good than they have done harm, and they are getting better every day.

The committee's records, which are on the desks of every Senator, bear strong witness to the soundness of the conclusions I have just stated, as, in fact, does the committee report.

I am not familiar with conditions in West Virginia, and I would not pretend to be. I have no doubt that the complaints which the Senator from West

Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has raised not only with respect to some conditions in his own State but also with respect to what he calls a subsidized version in Kentucky—with outside agitators and the like—may very well have some merit, and I would not want categorically to deny them.

I will say that the very able member of our committee, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] tells me that he has looked pretty carefully into these things and he still feels that it is his pleasure and obligation to support the bill, including emergency employment.

There are many times when I do not agree with my colleague from Pennsylvania. I go to no pains to conceal that fact. So, I can well understand that my friend, the Senator from West Virginia, the present occupant of the Chair, is well within his rights to say "That is true, but I do not agree with my colleague. I am right, and he is wrong." I have no quarrel with that. There are 2 sides to a question even in West Virginia.

The Senator's criticism of the VISTA program, exclusive of the mental health program in West Virginia, I am in no position to answer because I do not know the facts. However, again I feel compelled to say that I do know that wherever the committee went, with the exception of the criticism raised by the Senator from West Virginia, we found enthusiastic encomiums for the action of the VISTA volunteers.

I have attended a number of graduations of VISTA volunteers around the country and have made talks at these ceremonies. In my opinion, they are splendid young people, well worthy of the traditions of the Peace Corps, carried on on a domestic basis.

I do not wish to get into a discussion and argument with my friend, the Senator from West Virginia, in this regard. It may be that the VISTA volunteers in West Virginia are not doing what they should.

I think I can say on the basis of the investigation of the committee, the witnesses we heard, and the consultants whom we sent out to look into these matters that generally speaking across the country the VISTA volunteers are doing an extraordinarily fine job.

I hope that no effort will be made—and none has so far in the course of this debate—to disturb the continuing program which they are presently engaged in carrying out.

My friend, the Senator from West Virginia, said, I believe, that the Headstart program should be transferred to the Office of Education. So did a number of other Senators. However, we voted on that a few days ago, and the majority determined to leave it where it is. I think it is unnecessary for me to comment further on it.

The Senator pointed out that he would like to have a reappraisal by an independent agency. He was kind enough to say that he was not critical of the committee or of the investigation it made. So did other Senators.

I was happy to accept the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr.

PROUTY] and bring the General Accounting Office into the picture.

It may be that they can help us. I hope that they can. They are certainly well qualified in investigative techniques. How much understanding they have of the human elements involved here, we will see when they bring in their report. We now have the amendment in the bill. I suggest that, to that extent, we wait until next year to see what happens.

When it comes to the District of Columbia, the Senator from West Virginia is far more expert in that area than I am. I sat for 2 years on the District of Columbia Committee, but I got off by 1960 and cannot pretend to be an expert and I know that the Senator from West Virginia is. All I can say is that we did have one member of the subcommittee staff make what I thought was an investigation of some depth and inquire at some length concerning the poverty program in the District of Columbia.

He came back with a report speaking of it in glowing terms, admitting, of course, that there are some deficiencies.

I have no doubt that many of the specific instances mentioned by the Senator from West Virginia may very well be true. It is an enormous program. It would be surprising if there were not some defects.

The committee held 2 days of hearings here in Washington, at which leaders of the national planning organization and many others connected with the program testified.

Some of them were pretty critical of the effectiveness and the efficiency of the program.

I came out of that hearing, as one Senator, with an enormously high regard for Mr. Banks, executive director of the program who, unfortunately, in my judgment, has now left, and my friend, Mr. Lee, whom I look upon as a distinguished American.

He has held many high places in the Federal Government. In my opinion, he is also doing an excellent job as the chairman of the board of directors of the Upward Bound group, where he has to do a coordinating job that requires high skill. So I came out of the District of Columbia investigation with the feeling that by and large an excellent job was being done.

I do not know all the details. This is an area where I feel the Senator from West Virginia has superior knowledge and expertise in the field.

Let me speak briefly now about the Emergency Employment Act. The Senator has moved to recommit the entire bill with instructions to delete the Emergency Employment Act, title II.

I have no doubt that the Senator reaches a point of view in this regard which is shared by many of his colleagues, and it may well be that his point of view is shared by a majority—that we will find out tomorrow or a little later. I would not wish to quarrel with the Senator for his—in my judgment—unduly conservative point of view as to the very great need to have an emergency employment program to deal with the problems of the cities of America and the rural ghettos.

We saw a great deal of poverty as we went around the country—in the Delta counties of Mississippi, in the slums of Chicago, among the migrant workers in San Joaquin Valley in California, in Watts, and in a number of other places where I would suspect that the majority of the Senators have not had a real opportunity, as we in the subcommittee of necessity did, to see the conditions of misery and penury and squalor under which so many Americans are living, the end result being that thousands of them are being denied the good things in life and indeed are being deprived of their rights as free citizens of this great Republic.

The end result of the Senator's point of view—and I honor him for his point of view, as I say, because it is shared by many of his colleagues here—is that we will turn our back on the poor insofar as any effective employment program is concerned for the balance of this fiscal year.

We are turning our backs on the poor, if the Senator's views are to prevail—and I hope they will not—largely because the Senator thinks we cannot afford to support both the war in Vietnam and the war on poverty.

I have said enough on this subject on other occasions, so all I will do this evening is to define that issue and to point out that I have felt for a long time that we have a swollen military establishment, a military-industrial-scientific complex, which is taking this country down the road to disaster, and that we are neglecting many a problem which is a real threat to the civilization of which we are so proud when we put so much emphasis on the military and so little emphasis on our sense of compassion in doing what needs to be done for our needy fellow American citizens.

I shall not attempt to reply seriatim to the other arguments—and some of them are persuasive arguments—made by the Senator from West Virginia, but would rather turn away from an answer to his comments toward a positive espousal of the Emergency Employment Act.

In the hearings held by the committee throughout the length and breadth of the continental United States, I believe a clear consensus emerged that jobs are the single most important way to combat poverty. We had some pretty impressive testimony to that effect, which is set forth in the report of the committee. I shall do no more than to point out some of those who felt that jobs were the key answer—not the only answer, but the key answer—to poverty in the urban and rural ghettos.

Erwin D. Canham, editor-in-chief of the Christian Science Monitor and chairman of the Task Force on Economic Growth and Opportunity of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, told the committee:

Expert after expert, when consulted by the task force, has emphasized that income and place in the social and economic scheme can best be restored by providing the employable poor with training and job opportunities. These have the effect of bringing them into the mainstream of the economy, rather than merely paying them to remain outside.

Andrew Biemiller, director of legislation, AFL-CIO, recommended:

As a major aspect of the war on want we urge the inauguration of federally supported job-creating programs that would put the hard core unemployed to work providing needed public facilities and services.

Bayard Rustin, civil rights leader and executive secretary of the A. Phillip Randolph Institute, stated:

The great majority of the people who are poor, I am convinced, want work, but that work won't be found until we are prepared to establish a full and fair employment economy. We need public services, which is one means of creating full employment.

John Reading, mayor of Oakland, Calif., reported:

When visiting the neighborhood center, I find that most of all, the people want jobs. I feel very strongly, and the ones around me feel very strongly, that if we can provide jobs that we in turn then, over a period of time, will to a great extent solve the rest of the social evils that apply to a poor city.

These leaders reflect the views of the American people. In a public opinion poll taken August 14, 1967, to determine what the people believe would be an effective way to deal with the urban crisis, Louis H. Harris & Associates, Inc., found that 69 percent of the public favor setting up large-scale Federal work projects to give jobs to the unemployed.

The conclusion that jobs are the central need of the poor is well founded in statistics. In 1966 when the U.S. unemployment rate averaged 3.8 percent, the rate for the disadvantaged was much higher; for all Negroes, 7.3 percent; for all 16- to 19-year-old youths, 12.7 percent but for Negro youth, about 25 percent. The unemployment rate for those with 8 years or less of education tends to run twice the national average for all workers.

A survey of 10 urban slum areas conducted by the Labor Department in November 1966 found 1 out of 10 workers unemployed. Yet these figures do not tell the true story, for they do not reveal the extent of hidden unemployment. To get the whole picture it is necessary also to consider those with part-time jobs who want full-time work, those earning too little to meet their families' minimum subsistence needs, and those who could work but are not looking because they are discouraged at the prospects. Adding these to the traditional unemployment rate yields what the Labor Department calls the "subemployment" rate. In the 10 slum areas, this rate was 34 percent, or three times the usually reported unemployment rate for those areas.

In magnitude, the number of unemployed and looking for work in the United States has averaged nearly 3 million during the first half of 1967. To reduce unemployment to a rate of 3 percent, which used to be the Federal goal, would take 600,000 new jobs. To take care of underemployment and hidden unemployment might take twice that number, and perhaps more.

Nonetheless, projecting the findings from the 10 slum areas to the Nation as a whole, the Labor Department concluded that, as bad as the problem is, it is of manageable proportions. Given

more resources, the high rate of unemployment could be drastically reduced in a reasonable period of time. The committee is convinced that this would be true even with the addition of rural areas with severe unemployment, although the types of programs would vary some between urban and rural areas.

While a major part of the problem is the lack of job qualifications of the unemployed, no amount of training will solve the total problem unless the jobs are there. Conversely, if jobs are certain, training can be accelerated. As evidence, recall the illiterates who became production workers with only a few months on-the-job training during World War II.

The committee's amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, particularly to part B of title I, have expanded and strengthened the training programs for the disadvantaged. But this is not enough. The extent of unemployment in our inner city areas and in certain rural areas severely affected by technological change is such that a crisis exists. Emergency measures must be taken immediately. Federal funds should be invested now in creating jobs for the unemployed.

This reiterates what the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty recommended in 1964:

Federal, State, and local governments should undertake a joint program to directly employ the hard-core unemployed in poverty-stricken areas, both rural and urban, in an attack on the deficiencies of their own environments. Financial support should be provided by the Federal Government. Local governments and private groups should provide the proposals, planning, and administration.

Since then, three Federal commissions appointed by the President have affirmed these recommendations. In February 1966, the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress recommended a 5-year program of public service employment with a sum of \$2 billion for the first year. In June 1966, the White House Conference "To Fulfill These Rights" urged the development of "Government-financed employment programs on public works and services to guarantee the availability of jobs to able workers who cannot be placed in, or promptly, trained for, regular employment." In July 1967, the National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber proposed that Federal funds be granted to State and local governments and certain types of nonprofit institutions which would serve as "the residual employer" in rural areas with high unemployment until economic development programs can take hold.

Each of these bodies has identified public service employment as an especially fruitful source of additional, socially useful jobs. The "Automation" Commission, for example, estimated that at least 5.3 million such jobs could be filled; 1.2 million in medical institutions and health services, 1.1 million in educational institutions, 1.3 million in national beautification, 700,000 in welfare and home care, 350,000 in public protection, and 650,000 in urban renewal and sanitation. In a study conducted for the Office of Economic Opportunity, Greenleigh Associ-

ates, Inc., calculated that it would be practicable to fill more than 400,000 such jobs during the first year of a new employment program.

The evidence is strong and consistent. Jobs are central to solving the crisis of cities and depressed rural areas. Public service employment provides an immediate remedy. Federal resources must be used, but the job creation programs should be locally operated. All that is lacking is the national commitment. To supply this missing link the committee recommends the adoption of the Emergency Employment Act of 1967.

I have already adverted to the statement of the Urban Coalition, which specifically endorsed the Emergency Employment Act, which was jointly submitted to the committee by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVRS] and myself, and which comes to the floor with the support of a majority of the committee.

Before asking unanimous consent that the statement of the Urban Coalition of September 15 be printed in full in the RECORD, I should like to point out that the members of the Urban Coalition represent a uniquely wide spectrum of respectable opinion in the United States.

We have had some talk—some of it in a lighter vein, some of it not—about the "establishment" in America; but I would say that, across the spectrum, from respected leaders of industry and banking through the chief executives of our principal municipalities, to prominent educators and churchmen, across to noted civil rights leaders and the leaders of the great labor movements in our country, we have in this Urban Coalition about as powerful a group of respected citizens as is possible to bring together.

I will not read the names of all of them, but among them are Andrew Heiskell, chairman of the board of Time, Inc., and for many years the publisher of Life magazine; and A. Philip Randolph, the well-known civil rights and labor leader. They include the mayor of Atlanta, the mayor of Philadelphia, the mayor of Pittsburgh, the mayor of Detroit, the mayor of Boston, the mayor of Chicago.

These are the people who have to deal with the problems in the urban ghettos. They include Arnold Aronson, the executive secretary of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. They include some substantial industrialists: Roy Ash, president of Litton Industries; Frederick J. Close, chairman of the board of Aluminum Co. of America; Gilbert W. Fitzhugh, president of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.; David Rockefeller, president of Chase Manhattan Bank; Theodore Schlesinger, president of Allied Stores; Asa T. Spaulding, president of North Carolina Mutual Insurance Co.; Henry Ford II, chairman of the Ford Motor Co. Mayor Lindsay, of New York, I should not have skipped.

Prominent, too, are labor leaders George Meany and Walter Reuther. Among the civil rights leaders are Roy Wilkins and Whitney Young, Jr.

This is just a sampling of the strength of this leadership.

I now ask unanimous consent that the

statement of the coalition, issued on September 15, specifically endorsing title II of this bill, be printed in the *RECORD* at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

STATEMENT OF URBAN COALITION SEPTEMBER 15, 1967

The Urban Coalition endorses the Clark-Javits Emergency Employment Act as a significant step toward an urgently needed national emergency program to provide at least one million jobs. We urge the President to support it and we urge Congress to adopt it as part of the Economic Opportunity Act amendments this year.

With regard to the private sector, we commend Mr. Gilbert Fitzhugh of our National Steering Committee and the Insurance Industry for their recently announced commitment of \$1 billion in mortgage and investment funds for the reconstruction of the core areas of our cities. We are encouraged that the program will take advantage of rent supplements and that the federal government has developed an FHA-mortgage insurance program for these areas as well as middle and upper income families in the suburbs.

In support of the job program, the Emergency Convocation, held in Washington on August 24, and attended by 1,000 representatives of business and industry, organized labor, religious groups, local government and civil rights organizations, endorsed a Declaration of Principles, Goals and Commitments which called for legislation consistent with the following principles:

The federal government must enlist the cooperation of government at all levels and of private industry to assure that meaningful, productive work is available to everyone willing and able to work.

To create socially useful jobs, the emergency work program should concentrate on the huge backlog of employment needs in parks, streets, slums, countryside, schools, colleges, libraries, and hospitals. To this end, an emergency work program should be initiated and should have as its first goal putting at least one million of the presently unemployed into productive work at the earliest possible moment.

The program must provide meaningful jobs—not dead-end, make work projects—so that the employment experience gained adds to the capabilities and broadens the opportunities of the employees to become productive members of the permanent work force of our nation.

Basic education, training, and counseling must be an integral part of the program to assure extended opportunities for upward job mobility and to improve employee productivity. Funds for training, education, and counseling should be made available to private industry as well as to public and private nonprofit agencies.

Funds for employment should be made available to local and state governments, nonprofit institutions, and federal agencies able to demonstrate their ability to use labor productively without reducing existing levels of employment or undercutting existing labor standards or wages which prevail for comparable work or services in the area but are not less than the federal minimum wage.

Such a program should seek to qualify new employees to become part of the regular work force and that normal performance standards are met.

The operation of the program should be keyed to specific localized unemployment problems and focused initially on those areas where the need is most apparent.

The Clark-Javits Emergency Employment Act is responsive to these principles. It is also responsive to the conditions of unem-

ployment and despair revealed in the dozens of hearings held over many months by the Senate Subcommittee on Unemployment and is consistent with the findings and recommendations of the National Committee on Technology Automation and Economic Progress (Feb. 1966), the White House Conference to Fulfill These Rights (June 1966), and The National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber (July 1967).

In addition, we call upon Congress to expedite action in providing full funding for the poverty program, the rent supplement program and Model Cities. We also urge the adoption of the Equal Opportunity in Housing measure now pending in both houses.

We offer our full support in implementing these objectives.

ANDREW HEISKELL,
Cochairman.

A. PHILIP RANDOLPH,
Cochairman.

Mr. CLARK. The statement points out that an emergency convocation was held in Washington on August 24, attended by a thousand representatives of business and industry, organized labor, religious groups, local government, and civil rights organizations; and it endorsed the statement of principles, goals, and commitments which has just been printed in the *RECORD*.

I should point out that the coalition statement called upon Congress to pass emergency job legislation which would create 1 million jobs. That was a little too rich for the blood of Senator JAVITS and myself. We cut that 1 million down to 200,000, for 2 years, which could grow to 300,000 or perhaps 350,000, depending on how the program would be administered during that 2-year period.

We felt it was not feasible, under present congressional sentiment, to do what these leaders of business, labor, industry, and church groups asked us to do. Their program would have cost a minimum of \$5 billion for 1 year, or \$10 billion for 2 years. Ours, I point out, is a much more modest program.

Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia did not advert to Senator PROUTY's amendment, nor have I done so in this talk. But Senator PROUTY and I had a colloquy about it earlier today, which interested Senators can read in the *RECORD*. I must say that, as a pragmatist and, I hope, a realistic Senator and politician, I believe the best hope of doing something for the poor, unemployed Americans who live in our urban and rural ghettos, on this 3d day of October 1967, in the light of congressional sentiment, is for me, as the floor manager of this bill, to accept the Prouty amendment.

I have discussed this matter with my colleagues on the subcommittee which reported the bill. They feel as I do, that if we could get the entire \$2.8 billion for a 2-year program, this possibly would be perfection.

They feel it is most dubious that this could be done. They feel it is important, and so do I, that this should be a bipartisan effort to help the poor of America; not a Republican effort or a Democratic effort, but a bipartisan effort to join hands together to do something for these poor fellow citizens of ours who are denied so many of the good things of life.

I shall support the Prouty amendment tomorrow and I hope it will be agreed to. The Senator from Vermont described the measure at some length earlier this afternoon. I asked him a number of questions to bring out the strengths and possibly the weaknesses of his amendment. We will have little time tomorrow to debate the Prouty amendment.

Therefore, I say tonight that I shall support that amendment. I hope that absent Senators who may be interested will read of this support in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* tomorrow, and perhaps our long-suffering friends of the press—who I am sure want to get home for dinner as much as I do—will report the commitment I have just made.

(At this point Mr. CLARK assumed the chair.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I shall not prolong the discussion, except for a moment. I wish to say that I respect the viewpoint of the distinguished, able, and congenial Senator from Pennsylvania. I admire his compassion for the poor, and what I have said this afternoon was not in any way any personal criticism of his efforts. I know that he has put a great deal of thought and much effort into developing the hearings, taking the testimony therein, and into formulating the bill that is before the Senate.

I congratulate the Senator for his zeal. I share his compassion for the poor. I am sorry we cannot agree with regard to the wisdom of retaining title II in the bill.

I would imagine that, if exhaustive hearings were held on the subject, it might be possible, at some future time and under appropriate circumstances, for his subcommittee to bring some language before the Senate that I and other Senators who oppose title II could accept. However, as I said earlier, I believe it is the wrong time now and the wrong approach. I have made my case against title II and I shall not attempt to repeat it now.

I expect to vote for the bill on final passage, but this would be difficult for me to do if title II were to remain in this bill.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for the information of Senators who will read the *RECORD* in the morning, perhaps I should recall that, in accordance with the unanimous-consent request propounded by the majority leader today, it was agreed that after the prayer and disposition of the Journal tomorrow morning there will be a live quorum, following which 20 minutes will be allotted to the debate on the Prouty amendment, the time to be equally divided between the proposer thereof, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who opposes the amendment.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in ac-

cordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 4, 1967, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 3 (legislative day of October 2), 1967:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Edna M. Callaway, Orange Beach, Ala., in place of M. L. Brown, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Haakon T. Magnussen, Alpine, Calif., in place of P. G. Hall, retired.
Hugh A. Cassidy, San Rafael, Calif., in place of W. H. Williams, retired.

COLORADO

James A. Barrett, Mancos, Colo., in place of G. R. Noland, retired.

FLORIDA

Horace E. Treadwell, Oak Hill, Fla., in place of D. L. Hildale, resigned.

GEORGIA

James H. Campbell, Cleveland, Ga., in place of C. E. Head, retired.

IDAHO

Louise K. Gosselink, McCall, Idaho, in place of R. B. Fields, retired.

ILLINOIS

John P. Hanley, Wilmette, Ill., in place of L. J. Orr, retired.

INDIANA

Wayne A. Kern, Bedford, Ind., in place of W. E. Shirley, retired.

IOWA

Wesley T. Ward, Dallas Center, Iowa, in place of R. G. Mann, deceased.
Dale D. Stupp, Hazleton, Iowa, in place of J. J. Snoble, transferred.
Rose M. Gelhaus, Ledyard, Iowa, in place of E. S. McDonald, retired.
Myron W. F. Ihde, Monona, Iowa, in place of M. M. Funk, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Rose K. Durbin, Nazareth, Ky., in place of M. K. Egan, resigned.
Harold G. Rice, Waco, Ky., in place of M. M. Bush, retired.

LOUISIANA

Doris L. Bradley, Soudheimer, La., in place of E. J. Dalfume, transferred.
Estelle D. Gorman, Tullus, La., in place of C. D. Norsworthy, retired.

MARYLAND

Rachel B. Racine, Childs, Md., in place of F. B. Gallaher, retired.
George B. Hasson, Perryville, Md., in place of J. T. Barrow, retired.
William D. Beall, Stevenson, Md., in place of H. B. Long, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Robert L. Carrington, Granby, Mass., in place of R. T. Ruel, retired.
John G. Duffy, West Springfield, Mass., in place of R. J. Specht, retired.

MICHIGAN

Joseph V. Spreitzer, Allegan, Mich., in place of F. C. McOmber, retired.
John A. Mulligan, Plymouth, Mich., in place of George Timpona, retired.

MINNESOTA

Glenn O. Solomonson, Storden, Minn., in place of W. H. Roemer, retired.

MISSOURI

Robert E. Booth, Cainsville, Mo., in place of C. C. Thompson, retired.
Kenneth W. Bolton, Chaffee, Mo., in place of L. B. Papin, deceased.
Ralph O. Hood, Cosby, Mo., in place of W. C. Mandler, retired.
William E. Jenkins, Kahoka, Mo., in place of F. M. Story, retired.
Maurine Simmons, Malta Bend, Mo., in place of H. C. Taylor, deceased.

NEBRASKA

Betty G. Hoelting, Lawrence, Nebr., in place of W. H. Hoelting, deceased.
Bernadean R. Strufing, Martell, Nebr., in place of M. L. Wunderlich, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Laurent J. Ruell, Ashland, N.H., in place of C. E. Crowley, retired.
Richard P. Piper, Jr., Holderness, N.H., in place of J. M. Cripps, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Richard E. Case, Pennington, N.J., in place of G. C. Koeppe, resigned.

NEW MEXICO

Ernest S. Castillo, Belen, N. Mex., in place of Martin Baca, retired.

NEW YORK

Ethel M. Reilly, Esopus, N.Y., in place of A. C. Jones, retired.
Virginia E. Hunt, Greenwood, N.Y., in place of M. H. Burd, retired.
Hilliard R. Crane, Livonia, N.Y., in place of F. B. Densmore, retired.
John F. Fosina, New Rochelle, N.Y., in place of A. J. Rivers, retired.
Jarvis E. Ireland, Panama, N.Y., in place of L. R. Wagner, retired.
Melva J. Sherman, Shelter Island, N.Y., in place of N. B. Dickerson, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Robert F. Corbin, Sr., La Grange, N.C., in place of M. D. Harper, retired.

OHIO

John W. Schromen, Orrville, Ohio, in place of J. W. Evans, deceased.
Elmer R. Klinger, West Farmington, Ohio, in place of W. S. Rice, deceased.

OREGON

Gladys M. Mortimore, Mitchell, Oreg., in place of C. M. Norton, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

David G. Anderson, Enon Valley, Pa., in place of M. A. Simpson, retired.
Elizabeth A. Lis, Everson, Pa., in place of Victor Wolinski, retired.
Liberty R. Catherine, Morrisdale, Pa., in place of T. A. Howe, retired.
Delbert L. Potts, Saint Petersburg, Pa., in place of A. K. Francisco, retired.
Charles S. S. Reppert, Shoemakersville, Pa., in place of M. A. Shappell, retired.

RHODE ISLAND

Howard F. Tucker, Jr., Chepachet, R.I., in place of W. H. Seifert, retired.
Peter McLaren, Greenville, R.I., in place of R. L. Battey, retired.

TENNESSEE

Robert T. Jacobs, Beechgrove, Tenn., in place of J. A. Bryant, retired.
Edna E. Courtney, Butler, Tenn., in place of F. P. Curtis, retired.
Joseph W. Satterfield, Dandridge, Tenn., in place of R. M. Sams, transferred.
Harry D. Montgomery, Trenton, Tenn., in place of W. W. Taylor, retired.

TEXAS

Cornellous M. Hatch, Hamilton, Tex., in place of G. H. Boynton, deceased.
Charles E. Clifford, Jr., Hitchcock, Tex., in place of C. L. Woods, deceased.
Wesley E. Coburn, Huntsville, Tex., in place of T. G. Sandel, retired.

Robert E. Ligon, Loving, Tex., in place of M. B. Rowley, deceased.

Mary R. Morris, Mobeetie, Tex., in place of R. J. Tyson, retired.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Rupert R. Abramson, Frederiksted, V.I., in place of Curneall Watson, removed.

WEST VIRGINIA

Russell L. Morrow, Smithers, W. Va., in place of E. D. Burch, retired.

WISCONSIN

Louis S. Skarda, Coleman, Wis., in place of H. A. Martens, retired.
Richard L. Schwartz, Ixonia, Wis., in place of O. F. Huebner, retired.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate them for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Paul Masterton, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. Turner F. Caldwell, Jr., U.S. Navy.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

| | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| Allen, James E. | Christianson, Richard A. |
| Alley, Walter L. | Claassen, Aaron J. |
| Allison, Robert L. | Clapper, Richard F. |
| Anzini, Bert J. | Clark, Ray L. |
| Armstrong, Eldon L. | Cobb, Robert M. |
| Atchison, Thomas L. | Cody, Edward J. |
| Aubin, Charles D. | Collins, William V., Jr. |
| Bahr, Stephen M. | Connor, James V. |
| Baier, Joseph E. | Cook, Clifford V. |
| Bailey, Kenneth E. | Cornell, Clifford L. |
| Baird, Walter L. | Cornett, Arthur |
| Baker, Robert W. | Courtney, Marlin A. |
| Baker, Stanley C. | Cox, Arthur B. |
| Bakkala, Eugene J. | Craker, Paul W. |
| Ballinger, Robert W. | Creekmore, Edwin W., Jr. |
| Banks, Harold R. | Crosson, Bobby D. |
| Barrett, James L. | Cumble, James B. |
| Bean, Richard L. | Cyr, Robert T. |
| Becker, James R. | Dalton, David H. |
| Beckham, Jerry | Dameron, Jack E. |
| Bell, Walter A. | Dassler, Frederick W., Jr. |
| Bell, William F. | Davis, James R. |
| Bennett, James G. | Dawson, Wilbert E., Jr. |
| Benson, James N. | Dean, Donald R. |
| Bonjorni, Edward E. | Deemie, William H. |
| Bornman, Richard E. | Degange, James J. |
| Boston, Glenn J. | Densmore, Dean W. |
| Bourdon, Theodore J. | Dentremont, Albert G. |
| Boyd, Gerald G. | Dillon, James P. |
| Brashear, James E., Jr. | Disharoon, Donald L. |
| Breidert, William E. | Dobbs, Wiley G. |
| Brooks, Chapin C. | Dole, Howard W. |
| Brooks, Morris E. | Domanski, Bernard J. |
| Brown, Carl R. | Donnelly, Ambrose T. |
| Brown, Oval D. | Dotson, William T. |
| Brown, Richard S. | Dozier, Loyle B. |
| Bruce, James R. | Draper, James W. |
| Bryant, Robert W. | Duffy, Marvin L. |
| Bucholz, Roger C. | Duncan, Carl T. |
| Burck, Clarence W. | Durazo, Alfred M. |
| Burns, Dale M. | Eastberg, George E. |
| Burns, Jerome P., Jr. | Eckhoff, Clarence, J., Jr. |
| Bush, Harold S. | Edmison, William J. |
| Butler, Frank A. | Elliott, David F. |
| Butrovich, John, III | Ernst, Eugene E. |
| Butterfield, John F. | Everett, Carl S. |
| Cameron, John F. | Fee, James W. |
| Carlson, Robert W. | Fell, William G. |
| Carlyon, Walter E., III | Ferguson, James T. |
| Carver, Marion E. | |
| Cegler, Edmund C. | |
| Chappell, Ralph E. | |

- Fiske, Eugene G.
Flanagan, Donald S.
Foley, Robert F.
Franklin, Eugene C., Jr.
Frederick, James S.
Fried, Arthur A.
Friesen, James M.
Fuller, Jerry L.
Gammons, Robert A.
Garza, Jose E.
Gilbert, Proctor J.
Gilbert, Richard B.
Gillie, Earley C.
Gipp, Earl W.
Glass, Robert L.
Gless, Edwin H.
Goddard, Glen L.
Gomes, Benjamin J.
Good, James R.
Goodson, Joe B., Jr.
Gordon, Leonard
Graham, James E.
Graham, Ronald B.
Grantham, Nick H.
Gray, Lawrence S.
Gray, Robert J.
Greathouse, Robert L.
Green, George W.
Greenwell, William M.
Guthrie, Charlie M.
Haacke, Karl M.
Hahn, Gary T.
Haire, Charles R.
Hakes, Vander D.
Hall, Gaylon S.
Hall, John P., Jr.
Hall, John T.
Hansen, Jack C.
Hansen, Norman L., II
Harrelson, James T.
Harris, Hubert V.
Hearn, Ellison J.
Hefty, William A.
Heltzman, Dwayne J.
Helm, Samuel W.
Henderson, Ronald B.
Hendricks, Judson J.
Herrmann, Robert H.
Hess, Walter W.
Hewitt, William H.
Hilsabeck, Clayton N.
Hinds, Glenn W.
Hoglund, Delbert P.
Horne, Don M.
Hotalen, Robert J.
Hubble, Hilbert R.
Huckabone, Theodore W.
Hudson, Charles E.
Humphreys, Kellogg F.
Hunnell, Sherman M.
Hunt, Edmund J., Jr.
Hyneman, Roger T.
Irvine, Pickens W.
Irwin, Fred B., Jr.
Isaksen, Roy E.
Ivie, Gayland C.
Jackman, Richard M.
Jackson, Donald L.
Jackson, Roy B.
James, Leonard D.
Janas, James B.
Jeffords, John M.
Jensen, Robert J.
Johnson, Charles H.
Johnson, Douglas J.
Johnson, Golden H.
Jones, George R.
Jones, James R.
Kaufman, Jack J.
Kautz, John F.
Kear, Billie G.
Kegley, Ben L.
Keidel, Lawrence F.
Kimmel, Ronald C.
Kinard, Edgar C., Jr.
King, Francis L.
Kiser, Paul F.
Koch, Melvin A.
- Kochenower, Bobby D.
Kramer, Larry E.
Kunz, Gerald W.
Lakin, John B., Jr.
Landis, Robert S.
Lanier, Bobby R.
Lassley, Arthur R.
Laurick, George
Lavelle, Donald L.
Lepore, Daniel J.
Lindley, James R.
Listol, Lavern D.
Lloyd, William E.
Long, Gerald E.
Longstreth, William A.
Looney, Robert L.
Lopez, Ambler B. M.
Loveless, Sheldon L.
Ludwig, Harvey E.
Lyons, Leonard S.
Madsen, George G.
Mallett, Charles A.
Maroney, Derrell
Martin, Michael L.
Mason, Roger W.
Matthews, John E.
Maze, Robert A.
McCrea, Charles M.
McCreary, James D.
McCullough, Robert I.
McDonald, John L.
McFearin, Allen L., Jr.
McGauley, Gilbert E.
McKean, Robert W.
McKnight, Jimmie D.
McLaughlin, John W.
McMahon, Thomas W.
McMeekin, Richard L.
McNab, John D.
McNett, Donald D.
Meek, Phillip D.
Mellendorf, Wayne H.
Michael, Robert E.
Migliorini, Ernest B.
Miller, Francis L.
Miller, William P.
Miller, William W.
Minnick, Steve A., Jr.
Mohler, Marvin L.
Moore, Frederick S.
Morell, Ronald W.
Morgan, Benny M.
Morgan, Robert E.
Morrison, Virgil E.
Morse, Gilbert M.
Murdock, Glenn E.
Murphy, Jeremiah J.
Nelson, Walter O.
Newbern, Thomas N.
Newton, William J.
Nilsson, Kenneth M.
Oakes, Floyd M.
O'Brien, John L.
Older, Clinton D.
Outcault, Frank W.
Overson, Claude L.
Owens, Compton C., Jr.
Parker, Kenneth W.
Parker, Thomas F.
Patin, Carl A.
Patridge, Delmar E.
Patten, Freddie J.
Paulson, Glen T.
Peak, Jack R.
Pemberton, Colin C.
Perez, Richard
Pfeister, Raymond
Polinsky, John W.
Polk, Raymond F., Jr.
Pollock, Clifford E.
Powers, Ralph V.
Pritchard, Richard D.
Pritchett, Roland H.
Radford, David A.
Ralston, Gene D.
Randolph, Richard L.
Reynolds, Claude D.
Rhodes, James L.
Richardson, Dix
Ridley, William D.
- Ritz, Richard W.
Robbins, Shirley A.
Roberts, George H.
Roberts, John R.
Roberts, William A.
Robinson, Albert E.
Robinson, Keith D.
Roffey, Robert C.
Roman, Joseph N.
Rucker, Joseph T.
Ruhland, Ralph F.
Russell, James L., Jr.
Sadler, Jack R.
Sage, Ralph J.
Sandusky, Howard E.
Savage, Eugene M.
Schrader, Richard H.
Schwartz, Louie A.
Schwendinger, Ronald G.
Scobee, Mitchell O.
Scott, Jerry L.
Scott, Larry J.
Sears, Frederick D.
Seebeck, George
Seeler, Carl L.
Shaw, Earl D.
Shaw, Laroyce
Short, Mark S.
Shuford, Earl D.
Shustack, Edmund J.
Simmons, James R.
Simmons, Samuel M.
Smith, George H.
Smith, Guy A., Jr.
Smith, William F.
Snead, Thomas S.
Snodgrass, Carl E.
Soderberg, James L.
Spooner, Robert J.
Stanfield, James W.
Staton, Bobby P.
Stevenson, George A.
Stone, "S" "J"
Storaasli, Leroy O.
Strangeway, Leon E.
Stratton, Phil Z.
Suthowski, George E.
- Swann, Jack T.
Sweeting, Gerald B.
Sweet, Jack H.
Taylor, Richard L.
Templin, Charles L.
Thieme, Glenn A.
Thompson, Henry M.
Thompson, Vernon R.
Thorn, Paul E.
Thurman, Ronald J.
Tosson, Maurice C.
Tow, James D.
Trahan, Ronald G.
Trance, Roland G.
Tucker, Roger W.
Turner, James F.
Turner, William A.
Tyson, Paul D.
Valentine, Darrell L.
Vanderveen, Paul E.
Vipavetz, George F.
Wagner, Fernley R., Jr.
Wagner, Robert J.
Walker, William E.
Walls, Hulet G., Jr.
Walt, Charles E., III
Watford, Franky G.
Watkinson, William H., Jr.
Watson, Alva D., Jr.
Watson, William E.
Webb, Jay S.
Webb, Reginald C.
Weller, Jac S.
West, Edward E.
Whitehead, Robert C.
Williams, Donald F.
Williams, Paul V., Jr.
Williams, William
Windom, Bobby G.
Winterberg, Franklyn E.
Winthrop, Jeff G.
Wright, George G.
Wright, Willis T.
Yates, Robert E.
Yates, Robert H.
Yeager, John L.
Young, Martin P.
- SUPPLY CORPS**
Andrea, William R.
Archibald, Robert L.
Bartlett, Terry M.
Bennett, Herbert D.
Birmingham, Joseph F.
Black, John F., Jr.
Brigden, Jack A.
Collins, Jesse, Jr.
Craig, James B.
Dougherty, Daley D.
Driscoll, Eugene J.
Ellich, Mitchell
Emde, Arthur B.
Fisher, Richard C.
Frank, Daniel S.
Gonzales, Virgilio G.
Gutman, Philip W.
Hall, Robert L.
Harris, Allen W.
- CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS**
Grover, William B.
Gunn, Alexander C.
Hartman, Franklin J.
Jarvis, Jimmie E.
Jobe, Eugene G.
King, Jerry W.
Antonopoulos, Adam T.
Arlingdale, Gordon L.
Ayers, Samuel H., Jr.
Boyle, Richard L.
Butts, Charles M.
Carter, Franklin W.
Chomiak, Donald E.
Clem, Nicholas J.
Combs, Wesley B.
Cook, Jimmie C.
- MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS**
Corley, Richard A.
Cota, Richard J.
Dekrey, Charles R.
Dotson, Robert M.
Felt, Water R.
Fisher, Frank D. R.
Galbreath, Jerry D.
Gregory, George H.
Hilling, Levi N.
Holcomb, Howard E.
Lashley, Kenneth L.
- Lewis, Jack T.
McNamara, John E., III
Mullins, William F.
Oglesby, Norman G.
Pepera, Leroy J.
Platt, Austin E.
Pilkington, Richard H.
Renfro, Gene F.
- Lieutenant Robert Crafts, Junior, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy, for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.
Lieutenant (junior grade) Clyde W. Rogers, U.S. Navy, for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.
Lieutenant (junior grade) Ronald H. Thompson, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the Supply Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.
The following-named officers for permanent promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-3, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:
Bromley, Jack E.
Corman, William C.
Heckbert, Donald F.
Johnston, Benjamin M.
- Sessions, William M.
Smith, George D.
Smith, George R.
- The following-named officers for permanent promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-4, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:
Reustle, Charles H.
Wheeler, Eugene D.
- The following-named officers for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:
- LINE**
Brockley, John P.
Burgess, Larry L.
Craig, Norman L.
Crane, Stephen H.
Elliott, Thomas J.
Grieve, James E.
Gullickson, Lamoline K.
Long, Michael D.
Mellin, William F., Jr.
Morgan, William T.
West, Franklin G., Jr.
Withey, Thomas A.
Wixom, Robert F.
Young, Terrence J.
- SUPPLY CORPS**
Anderson, Edward J., Jr.
Clafin, Neville H.
Ketcham, Richard D.
Edward S. Hartford, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and in the temporary grade of lieutenant.
The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade):
James A. Haugen
Joseph J. Rudy, Jr.
- The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the line or staff corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:
Daniel W. Aljoe
George T. Allen
Ronald D. Alley
Edward L. Anderson
William A. Angus III
Russel L. Appleyard
Fredric G. Arnaw
Lawrence J. Asmus
Bert L. Atwater
Albert M. Bacco
Robert T. Bailes
Stephen A. Banks
Anthony J. Baratta Jr.
Terrell W. Barlow
Gerard J. Barrett
Gerard F. Becker
Donald W. Blackwood
Gerhard H. Bonas, Jr.
- John J. Born
Carleton B. Brink
Mark S. Brothers
James W. Brown
Jack A. Burgess, Jr.
Charles A. Burns
Phillip T. Buss
Mark L. Byars
Richard B. Carter
James F. Casey, Jr.
Howard M. Chatham
Cecil A. Clabaugh
Jerry A. Clements
Melvin A. Coble
William R. Cooper
Philip G. Corrigan
Anthony E. Cristina
Daniel H. Dennison, Jr.

Henry N. Didier
William R. Diwgoish
Anthony W. Dougherty
Robert E. Douglas
Jesse C. Drain III
Robert F. Duminlak
Robert W. Erikson
William S. Fellner
Richard M. Fessenden
Michael B. Flaherty
Jimmy M. Forbes
Floyd E. Freeman
Kevin P. Gallen
Anthony J. Gardella
Jeffrey W. Gartner
James E. Glading
Stephen W. Glidden
Eric R. Goepfert
Charles M. Goodsell
Gerald L. Green
William G. Groepper
Marshall V. Hall
James P. Hampson
Timothy M. Harisook
Charles R. Harley, Jr.
George S. Harris
Ralph R. Heffernan
James F. Higgins, Jr.
Thomas A. Hoffman
Bruce M. Holzapfel
Harwood Hoover, Jr.
Harry J. Hopcroft, Jr.
Alan L. Inglis
Clinton W. Inouye
Oleg Jankovic
Bernard Janov
John A. Jedrlinac
Robert K. Johann
Michael A. Judge
Thomas J. Keagy
Walter F. Keane, Jr.
James A. Kilpatrick
Albert Lew
Eric D. Lindstrom
John S. Locke
Frederick C. Louder, Jr.
Michael C. McConnell
Clemie McKinney
William T. McLaughlin
Dwight W. McNeace
William T. Magee, III
John M. Malone
William D. Marshall
Richard L. Martin
Martin C. Meade
Robert P. Meadows
Gordan C. Menzies, Jr.

James W. Whatley (Navy enlisted scientific education program candidate) to be a permanent ensign in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

William D. Shepard
Stanley B. Young (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Emile G. Abbott III
Homer A. Anderson, Jr.
Ernest L. Bade
Dean J. Beasley
Roger A. Bell
Joseph J. Bellanca
Victor J. Bilotta
Eugene L. Brown, Jr.
Joseph B. E. Brown, Jr.
Ronald K. Burke
James M. Carter

William G. Mock
Julian L. Moon III
Vincent S. Morgan
Tim T. Morris
Hugh R. Muir
Raymond D. Munkres
Raymond S. Nichols
Jeremy J. Nittle
William J. Norris
Thomas C. O'Connor, Jr.
Raymond J. Palmer
Martin E. Plante
Joel A. Porter
Kenneth W. Prater
James E. Pruske
Orville G. Ramer
John N. Raudabaugh
John G. Reedy
William L. Rogers
Carl W. Rosengrant
Frederick G. Ruben
Paul A. Schaeffer
Roger L. Schenkel
Robert C. Schucker
Robert E. Schunter
Paul B. Shaffer
Tommy L. Shanyfelt
Porter R. Shults, Jr.
Stephen R. Smith
Robert M. Souter, Jr.
Wayne P. Starke
Victor J. Starks
David H. Starr, III
Thomas J. Stewart
John W. Strassberger, Jr.
Jonathan W. Strom
Theron S. Taber, III
Kenneth W. Tapscott
Thomas W. Teneyck, Jr.
Kenneth R. Thompson
Willard S. Titus, III
James P. Virtue
Edwin J. Voss, II
David S. Watson
Ervin R. Way, Jr.
Richard D. Webb
Morris A. Weseloh
William R. Williams
William T. Williams
John H. Wilson
Carl J. Withee
Richard H. Woodrich
William W. Wright
Larry P. Yarham
Steven C. York

Robert S. Gold
William R. Grandolfo
Joseph P. Green
Donovan D. Hanson
Garry C. Harris
William O. Harrison
Henry D. Haynes
Frank E. Isabelle
David G. Johnson
Harvey M. Jones
James K. Jones
Dennis M. Jurczak
Donald J. Kearney
John E. Kelleher, Jr.
Patrick J. Kelly
Donald W. Klopp
James A. Lambert, Jr.
Michael J. Levine
Robert B. Lewis
Thomas H. Loecker
Michael J. Lynch
Martin L. McRoberts
Ross E. McDonald
Robert B. Mallon
Calvin Marantz
Richard H. Mathews
Richard F. Meese
Norman D. Nelson
Craig R. Nolte

Jack V. Lowman (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Charles M. Kawahara
Harry C. Mullins

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert W. Hinman
John R. Lohr

Warrant Officer (W-1) Stuart R. Heath to be a warrant officer (W-2) in the Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major:

Peter E. Benet
Thomas C. Cox
George M. Edmondson
Charles W. Gobat
Robert L. Gray
John I. Hudson

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain:

George V. Best
Edward M. Condra, III

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Edward T. Barfield
Raymond C. Kinkead

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Heinz Ahlmeyer, Jr.
Laverne B. Arndt
Michael F. Barber
Patrick L. Barry
Lawrence J. Bolger
Walter R. Burroughs
Larry E. Campbell
Duane B. Capps
James M. Chapin
Clayton C. Christensen
Patrick J. Connor

Phillip M. Park
William H. Peloquin
Albert B. Pleet
Joel A. Reisman
Richard F. Romfh
Jay F. Rowe
Robert H. Rozendal
William A. Schueller
Paul L. Schell
John A. Shea
John H. Senecal
Milton B. Shields
Nolan D. Shipman
Harold E. Sleight II
Philip R. Somers, Jr.
Dean E. Sorensen
Joseph A. Testa
Robert W. Tom
Donald R. Tredway
Edward S. Tucker
James W. Tyson
Gary F. Velat
John C. Vidoloff
Eugene J. Voltolina
Robert E. Walley III
James A. Waltermire
James L. Wolfson
David B. Zurschmeide

Thomas L. Hall
Charles H. Hawkins, III
Donald R. Head
George R. Hofmann
Richard F. Hoogerwerf
Laurens J. Jansen
Joseph D. Joiner
Lee D. Kane
John N. Kennedy, Jr.
Frederick L. Kingery
Robert A. Kisch
Norman E. Lane, Jr.
Fred C. Lash
Michael R. Layman
Stephen I. Leonard
Frank Libutti
Gary N. Long
James J. Marshall
Dennis E. McCloskey
James J. McKnight
Eugene G. Meiners
John T. Mero
Russell E. Moke
Joseph H. Murphy
Clyde W. Muter, Jr.

Captain James A. Addison, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy (Retired), to be a permanent captain in the Medical Corps of the Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, 1211.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Howard J. Samuels, of New York, to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
Rev. Alexander George, St. John's Eastern Orthodox Church, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we bow before You and acknowledge that we have failed to lift our eyes to the vision of peace among men which You have revealed to us. Teach each of us to be dissatisfied with fine words, to work constantly for the brotherhood of man and justice for all men. Make us one under You in quest of the precious things of the spirit. Bestow upon us truth and liberty, human rights, the dignity of the human person, equality of large and small, and peace's blessings.

Let us rededicate ourselves to the work for which this House of Representatives was elected—to save our own and generations from the scourge of war, to construct a world which guarantees the freedoms, justice, and peace which are Your endowment to all Your children.

We ask this in the name of one who never won a committee vote nor who was ever found among the majority opinion of His day, Christ Jesus, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SUPPORT OF CEASE-FIRE AND NEGOTIATIONS IN VIETNAM

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to